DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 554 SP 006 485

AUTHOR	Daniel, K. Fred; Crenshaw, Joseph W.
TITLE	What Has Been and Should Be the Role of State Education Agencies in the Development and Implementation of Teacher Education Programs (Both Pre and Inservice)? A Review and Analysis of Literature.
INSTITUTION	Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	3 Sep 71
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-3315
NOTE	138p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Theodore E. Andrews, Director, Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, State Education Dept., 99 Washington Ave., Suite 1941, Albany, N.Y. 12210 (no price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*State Agencies; *State Departments of Education; State Legislation; State Programs; *State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Programs; Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

This book presents a broad, detailed, and documented discussion of the role of the state in teacher education. The book is divided into three chapters: the role of the state education agencies; the role of the state education agencies as applied to teacher education (which includes discussions of teacher certification and teacher education program approval); and state education in three different states, Washington, Florida and New York, each moving towards changes in teacher education. Each chapter presents the historical background of the subject, with appropriate documentation, and notes pertinent books on the subject as they become relevant in the course of the discussion. There is a selected bibliography. (JA)

ED 076554

WHAT HAS BEEN AND SHOULD BE THE ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS (BOTH PRE AND INSERVICE)?

A Review and Analysis of Literature

by

K. Fred Daniel and Joseph W. Crenshaw

Edited by

Philip Doughty

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared for the
Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
Division of Assessment and Coordination
U. S. Office of Education
Order #OEC-0-71-3315
September 3, 1971

SP 006 485

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FOREWORD

The Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education is pleased to make available to interested readers this publication. Developed through a contract with the United States Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, this volume should be of great assistance to those interested in the role of state education agencies.

The Consortium is particularly grateful to Allen Schmieder of the United States Office of Education and to K. Fred Daniel and Joseph W. Crenshaw for their permission to publish and disseminate what we feel is a document of particular significance for state education personnel.

MULTI-STATE CONSORTIUM ON
PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE
Washington	Wendell C. Allen
Oregon	Lee G. Wells
Utah	Roger C. Mouritsen
Arizona	John Potts
Texas	Tom T. Walker
Minnesota	Patricia J. Goralski
Vermont	Robert Vail
New York	Vincent C. Gazzetta
Florida	Nell Kannwischer

Administering State New York

Project Director
Theodore E. Andrews
New York State Education Department

Stuart E. Dean
United States
Office of Education Representative

Funded by a U. S. Office of Education,
Title V, Section 505, grant

PREFACE

This paper was commissioned by the Division of Assessment and Coordination, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education. It is one of a series of papers by a variety of authors intended to survey and synthesize relevant literature in the areas of (a) institutional change, (b) teacher training, and (c) inservice training and curriculum development. This is one of the five papers in the area of teacher training.

The method followed in preparing this paper, as dictated by the commission, was first to assemble relevant literature, then to review and analyze that literature, and finally to prepare a narrative describing and interpreting the contents of the literature. The description and interpretation are attempts to convey the message of the original authors. The authors of the present paper have attempted to resist the temptation to editorialize about the original works.

Since the state education agency (SEA) role in teacher education derives from the general role of the SEA, Chapter I of this report traces the general role, minimizing references to teacher education. The primary author of this Chapter was Joseph W. Crenshaw, Chief of the Bureau of Curriculum and Instruction, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Florida Department of Education.

Chapter II reviews and discusses the literature on teacher education within the context of the general SEA role. The primary author of this Chapter was Fred Daniel, Associate for Planning, Florida Department of Education.

Chapter III takes a case study approach in reviewing the literature. It looks at three states--Florida, New York, and Washington--and describes the approach which each state is taking to improve teacher education. These three states were selected because their state education agencies have taken decisive steps to affect the direction of teacher education. Furthermore, they represent contrasts in size, geography, and approach to state leadership in teacher education. The primary author of this Chapter was Fred Daniel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

CHAPTER

I. THE ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES 1

Historical Background

Functions of State Education Agencies

The Regulatory Function
The Leadership Function
The Operational Function

Additional Literature on State Education Agencies

The Outlook for State Education Agencies

Footnotes

II. THE ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES APPLIED TO TEACHER EDUCATION 31

Historical Development

Internal Influences on SEA Role

Chief State School Officers
Professional Personnel in Teacher Education and Certification

Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

Appropriate Jurisdiction for Certification
Standards for Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval
Regulation of Inservice Education

Literature on the SEA Leadership Role in Teacher Education

USOE Sponsored Conferences
The Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-Step)
Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching

Footnotes

CHAPTER PAGE

III. THREE CASE STUDIES 91

The Andrews Paper

Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

Appropriate Jurisdiction for Certification
Standards for Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval
Regulation of Inservice Education

Leadership Activities

Conclusion

Footnotes

BIBLIOGRAPHY 121

CHAPTER I: THE ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Public education is a state responsibility. The Tenth Amendment of the federal Constitution assigns to the states those powers which are neither reserved to the federal government nor denied to the states. Among these is education. Admittedly, a great deal of discretion has traditionally been exercised by local school corporations; this has been possible only by virtue of authority granted by state governments.

Each of the fifty states holds the authority to determine the conditions under which schools shall be established, the qualifications necessary for persons who teach in the schools, and the specific subjects which can and shall be taught in the schools. Each state government exercises leadership by establishing constitutional provisions for an education system and by establishing policies intended to make it possible for each child within the state to secure a high quality education.

State education agencies (SEA's)--variously called Department of Education, State Department of Education, Department of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, and State Board of Education--are the executive agencies within state governments which carry out general supervision and coordination of the educational programs of the separate states.

Serving as head of the state education agency is a chief state school officer, called variously Commissioner of Education, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Superintendent of Education, Superintendent of Schools, and Secretary of Education. "State Department of Education," the most common designation for a state education agency, comprises the chief state school officer and his staff who are authorized by law and who function in accordance with policies adopted by the state board of education.[1]

There are distinct differences, as well as equally distinct similarities, among the various state education agencies. To comprehend why a particular SEA operates in a specific way, it is essential to understand the beliefs and values of the people and the influences that have been operating in the particular state as well as those in the larger national setting.[2]

Historical Background

Morphet, Johns, and Reller trace the slow and uneven evolution of state responsibility for education in America. They report that the adoption of the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 constituted a major step forward toward instituting a policy concerning the role of education in the new nation. The adoption of these ordinances and the provisions of the federal constitution were a clear signal that the American people had begun shortly after declaring their independence to accept the fact that education is a vital concern of the people of each state and as such should rightfully be a state function.

By the time the union of the states was formally organized, all of the original thirteen states had passed laws providing for some degree of education through schooling. Early in the 19th century, as more states adopted new constitutions or revised their original ones, the trend toward the inclusion of stronger and more clear-cut provisions relating to state responsibility for education becomes increasingly evident.

New York State established the first State Board of Education in 1784, but it was not until 1904 that it was given the responsibility for the public schools. Prior to that it had concerned itself solely with colonial colleges and academies. The first significant forward progress in the development of state education agencies occurred when Massachusetts established a State Board of Education in 1837.[3]

The movement to provide a chief state school officer in every state gained considerable momentum in the second quarter of the 19th century. This expansion was prompted by three developments:

1. The significant contributions of Horace Mann, the first state superintendent of Massachusetts.
2. The need for some state official to keep track of the school lands and account for the funds derived therefrom.
3. The growing awareness of the need for someone representing the state to collect information, make reports, and answer inquiries regarding common schools that were being organized in most communities.[4]

Prior to 1830, only three states--New York, Maryland, and Michigan--had provided for the position now commonly known as chief state school officer. Yet, by the beginning of the 20th century, all states had provided for a state superintendent.

During the first half of the twentieth century the state education agency emerged into a new and vital role in American education. This emergence was influenced by two factors: (a) It was recognized that local school units, existing in educational isolation, could not meet and deal with the vast economic, social, and technological changes which were occurring in society during these years. (b) It was also recognized at the same time that while state direction and assistance were necessary, it could not be provided by state education agencies which were chiefly occupied with clerical and statistical tasks. The obvious conclusion was that, if modern educational needs are to be fulfilled, state education agencies must rise to a position of leadership and service in the educational affairs of the state and become a working partner with regional and local school authorities. This transition, while earnestly to be desired, has not been totally achieved. Some states have made rapid progress, others are still in the early stages of development.[5]

Another significant event in the history of state education agencies occurred just six years ago, when billions of dollars were allocated to education by the 89th Congress. A decision was made to strengthen the authority of state education agencies by funnelling a large portion of the money through their hands, at the same time providing funds to develop the leadership capacity of the state agency. This changed the role of state education agencies by combining with the leadership function a new type of regulation whereby the state education agencies became responsible for coordination of exemplary and innovative projects of local school districts financed by the federal government. Important in this action was the regulation by the federal government that the attainment of national goals for education depends upon the leadership and character of state education agencies.[6]

Functions of State Education Agencies

For the purpose of this discussion, the role of state education agencies is equated with the functions of state education agencies. Functions are not to be confused with services. According to Beach's study, functions of state education agencies may be defined as their broad and comprehensive responsibilities. These are to be distinguished from services which are the acts performed to discharge the duties imposed by the functions. Functions are few; services are many. A wide variation, it should be noted, is discernible in the state. The variation exists in the relative emphasis placed upon each of the functions and in the number of services required to carry out the functions which ranges from few to many.[7]

The desirability of selecting functions, rather than services, as the basis for analysis is illustrated by Pierce. He points out that state education agencies, for the most part, are organized with special attention to areas of service. He identifies as many as thirty-three areas of service which are offered by four or more state education agencies. However, the patterns of organization he observed differed to such a degree that it was difficult to draw meaningful generalizations.[8]

Perhaps the best single volume dealing with the role of state education agencies is still The Function of State Departments of Education by Fred F Beach, although it was published as long ago as 1950. Beach states that "state departments of education occupy a strategic position in the structure of American education. The chief state school officer is responsible for the long-range planning and professional leadership of the state's educational enterprise. No other official state agency is in the position to wield such influence for the advancement of education. The functions of state departments of education and their expression through services are, therefore, a major concern of all the people."[9]

Beach identified three major types of functions--leadership, regulatory, and operational.[10] Since Beach's study in 1950, other studies have emerged, but, while expanding and modifying the list of functions of state education agencies, they have not changed materially the functions listed by Beach.

In 1967, Layton referred to Beach's three functions of state education agencies, but he divided the leadership function into three separate activity areas, making a total of five major activity groupings--operational, regulatory, service, developmental, and public support and cooperation.[11]

In a position paper issued by the Council of Chief State School Officers, State and Local Responsibilities for Education, the role of the state is clearly related to providing leadership and determining the instructional programs to be offered by the schools. The report points out, as Beach did, that SEA's also perform two other major functions, that of a regulatory agency and that of a state governing and operating agency.[12]

The Regulatory Function

The regulatory function, which essentially arises from the specifications of state law and state constitutions, includes the responsibility for approving programs, applying sanctions, supervision, and distribution of funds.[13] This function is designed to help protect the lives and health of the children and youth of the state and assure an educated citizenry. The state has the recognized responsibility to establish those minimum standards that are universally applicable. Many regulatory activities are designed primarily to ensure maximum educational opportunities for all children or youth. At the same time, state education agencies avoid regulations which would limit the freedom of the local school system to go beyond the established standards.[14]

The regulatory function is equally concerned with the responsible stewardship of public resources. State regulations endeavor to guarantee wise and economical use of educational funds and ensure effective management of the educational enterprise.[15]

The issuance of certificates or credentials for teachers has been a commonly accepted regulatory role of the state education agency. Specific standards from state to state show wide differences, and it is generally agreed that a totally satisfactory program has not yet been found. The number of credentials issued varies widely, with some states issuing very few and others extremely large numbers.[16] The approval of institutional programs of teacher education is a regulatory activity associated with teacher certification. The literature on regulation in teacher education is reviewed in Chapter II.

Campbell and Sroufe point out that the traditional major functions of the state education agencies, regulation and leadership, have called in the past for a large portion of state resources allocated to the agency to be channeled toward regulatory activities, while only a small portion of the agency's resources has been available for leadership activities. It is felt that in the future this situation will reverse itself; and although the total of resources available to the department may not be much greater, their functional allocation will shift from emphasis on regulation to emphasis on leadership. Consequently, according to these authorities, the traditional emphasis on regulation should be reduced in favor of a growing emphasis on leadership.[17] Morphet, Johns, and Reller observe that while in many states considerable emphasis has been placed on regulatory activities and limited attention has been given to leadership, the reverse sometimes is true.[18]

Campbell and Sroufe do not propose to eliminate regulatory activities, but they feel strongly that modification of regulatory goals and procedures is required if state agencies are to meet the challenges of modern times. State education agencies must struggle against the many forces conducive to rigid standardization of procedures and emphasize instead desired outcomes. The goal of regulation, if continued at all, should not be to ensure that certain routines are followed.

A more desirable goal, while still regulatory, would seek to perform the regulatory activity according to the criteria of performance, thereby satisfying the conditions of increased educational expectations and the demand for increased rationality in educational decision-making. To put it simply, it is more important that there be concern for the achievement of pupils than merely for the attendance of pupils.[19]

The Leadership Function

The responsibilities of all state education agencies have multiplied appreciably in the past 10 to 20 years. Concerned originally, for the most part, with accounting and reporting, the responsiblities over the years expanded to include inspection and regulation. Currently, there is a growing emphasis on leadership in planning and effecting improvements.[20] Pierce says the leadership role is increasing in importance and reflects a definite trend away from former major emphases on accounting, reporting, and inspection. Various aspects of leadership often stressed are overall coordination of the state school system, planning for further development of the system, research, consultative services, public relations, and evaluation.[21] Beach names planning, research, advising and consulting, coordinating, and public relations as leadership functions.[22]

A leadership responsibility of the state education agency, often overlooked, sometimes by the legislature itself, is to advise the legislature, expedite procedures and clarify its rules, and assist in executing many of its statutes. Lacking the technical knowledge and organization to carry on this function, the legislators turn wisely to the state education agency when statewide action or interpretation is necessary.[23]

The manner in which the state education agency operates in providing leadership services differs from the pattern often followed in regulatory activities. The trend is toward a consulting and helping relationship to local schools rather than the authoritarian approach. An acceptable goal of SEA leadership is to assist the development of leadership and initiative within the school districts.[24]

Statement of the Council of Chief State School Officers

The Council of Chief State School Officers has issued two major reports which say much about the leadership role of state education agencies. Portions of the contents of those two reports are summarized below.

A statement, published in 1952 by the Council titled The State Department of Education, lists six aspects of the leadership function of state education agencies: (a) planning, (b) research, (c) consultation, (d) coordination, (e) public relations, and (f) inservice education.

Of special import here is inservice education as a leadership activity. This implies responsibility for providing opportunities, facilities, and personnel for the continuing professional growth of all persons in the state who are engaged in any aspect of education work. Such persons include the professional staff of the state education agency, as well as the educational forces served by the state.[25]

The role of the state education agency for inservice education includes the responsibility for encouraging, facilitating, and supporting those activities which result in desirable growth and increased effectiveness as a practitioner in the education profession. More than ever before in history, a continuing educational program of improvement is currently indicated, not only for updating the competencies and skills of the staff but also as an antidote to stagnation or deterioration.

The Council makes several additional recommendations regarding the

SEA responsibilities in inservice education. State education agencies should provide leadership and source materials to encourage inservice training programs at the district and local levels. Administrators, supervisors, teachers, custodians, and bus drivers all need specialized skills and understandings which could be increased in planning clinics, conferences and workshops resulting from the leadership of the state education agency. The cooperation of institutions of higher education and other agencies should be sought in developing inservice training programs for teachers and other personnel. Inservice education should not neglect its responsibility for meeting the need for the improvement of administrative and supervisory personnel. Inservice education, not a one-time thing, should be continuous and should be evaluated and redesigned in terms of the identified needs of the participants.[26]

Public relations is also listed as a leadership role in the same publication. Public relations means essentially the same thing as good human relations. Public education stands in need of the development of an enlightened public understanding of the schools. The state education agency has the responsibility for providing strong leadership in this area through priming and maintaining, on its own initiative, a balanced public relations programs.[27]

Consultative activities of the state education agency are advisory efforts related to the solution or investigation of educational problems. Dissemination, as well as investigation, is an integral part of this process. As newer and better methods and procedures are developed, the state education agency through well-organized consultative services should acquaint local and district personnel with new and emerging research, some of which may still be in the process of completion. The state education agency is the logical agency to provide the competent professional and technical consultative services to local school authorities, other state agencies, and the public in all areas of the state program.[28]

Coordination responsibilities require state-level administration to seek, to find, and to guarantee a balanced and harmonious state program of education. Coordination activities are aimed at the elimination of gaps in educational services, the prevention of over-emphasis on particular services, and the elimination of duplication of effort.[29]

Research, the Council asserts, is essentially a method of inquiry, concerning itself with the old and the new, the tried and the untried. Research activities should result in fresh and improved ways of achieving familiar objectives and a growing knowledge of ways of accomplishing other and newer objectives that appear desirable.

The state education agency, through its consultative services, should stimulate local school authorities, colleges, and universities to conduct research. It should coordinate its own such activities with similar activities of other official and professional organizations concerned with education.

Planning concerns itself with the identification of problems and purposes and the determination of ways and means through which desired objectives may be reached through planning. Alternative courses of action, considered in terms of purposes to be achieved, should be evaluated and ordered so that resources may be most effectively utilized.[30]

The Council's more recent statement is entitled, State and Local Responsibilities for Education: A Position Statement. This document lists state-level leadership responsibilities as planning, research and evaluation, experimentation and innovation, consultative services, organization for effective services, inservice education, teacher education, certification and accreditation. It deals more with what the state role should be than with what it currently is.[31]

The Council underscores the need for qualified state education agency personnel to cooperate closely with local education authorities in establishing and maintaining instructional programs of increasing quality. In this report, the advisory and consultative functions of the state education agency emerge as its most important roles. The argument for state consultation is built on the contention that local school programs are constantly changing as the result of new needs and redirected emphases. The report continues with the assertion that leadership and assistance of this kind from the state education agency can reduce the need for state regulatory functions through the development of mutual confidence and understanding.

This report assigns to the state education agency a new responsibility which results from increasing urbanization and the disturbing conditions it brings. These conditions necessitate both physical and human renewal, especially in large cities with ghettos characterized by a heavy concentration of socially and economically disadvantaged persons. Assigning to SEA's the role of assisting in solving these problems through assessment of needs and sponsorship of appropriate legislation at the state level, the authors propose that the state education agencies move into fresh fields outside their traditional roles and provide active leadership in the specific promotion of the general welfare of education. Specifically, the SEA is assigned the function of assisting urban communities to prevent dropouts, to devise unique programs to keep potential dropouts in school, at least until high-school graduation, and to assist in job placement for those who cannot be kept in school.

The state education agency is urged to encourage, facilitate, and support programs that will coordinate education with actual employment opportunities in the large metropolitan centers, thereby assigning the SEA's the role of achieving a closer cooperation with other state agencies responsible for social services, welfare, health, conservation, and law enforcement.[32]

State education agencies are also urged to move strongly into their increasingly important leadership role as it pertains to federal legislation and federal programming. SEA's should influence the development of federal programs and the guidelines for use of federal funds.

State education agencies should provide services that urban areas, because of cost, cannot perform as economically or as adequately as the state agency. This would require special urban-oriented services in such areas as research and development and the collection and dissemination of documentary and analytical information. State education agencies are given the additional responsibility of exploring how resources already available in their urban areas can be used to the best possible advantage.[33]

While the role of the SEA is expanded in relation to special urban needs, it must not be done so at the expense of dealing adequately with the continuing and equally pressing problems in rural education. The Council contends that state agencies must exert a special leadership role if educational needs of the rural youth are to be met, pointing out that in this area other adequate leadership resources are seldom available.[34]

The Operational Function

Beach reports that by 1950 legislatures had assigned some operational functions in all of the states.[35] Operational activities include operating area vocational schools and state teachers colleges; classes in citizenship, adult education, and trades; cultural and educational institutions or programs of service directed to the public at large; and programs of service to individuals including vocational rehabilitation, teacher placement, and teacher retirement services.[36,37]

Morphet, Johns, and Reller point out that some authorities in recent years have questioned the desirability of assigning operational functions to state education agencies. Beach is one such authority. He raises grave doubts as to the advisability of the inclusion of the operational functions in the state education agency's list of responsibilities. He lists some exceptions, but justifies them only on the basis of unusual circumstances.[38]

Campbell and Sroufe also recommend that state education agencies seek to reduce their operational activities to the maximum extent possible. This move will allow an agency to utilize its total resources more efficiently, an accomplishment which is almost impossible if the majority of agency personnel are assigned untouchable status because of their work in autonomous agencies only nominally a part of the SEA.[39]

Beach contends further that no one would seriously propose that the state, acting through the state department of education, operate all schools, classes, and educational programs. Such a proposal, he states, would immediately be rejected as contrary to the basic philosophy underlining the pattern of decentralized control upon which state educational systems are established.[40] He further states that, while leadership and regulatory functions are universally recognized as necessary and appropriate roles of the state education agency, operational functions are not.[41]

Additional Literature on State Education Agencies

Beach and Will in their 1955 basic study set the pattern for most of the other studies of state agency roles.[42] Little investigation was done before that time. Roe said in 1961 that the trend over the past three years was toward the clarification of the role of the state education agency. A general bibliography on the powers and practices of state departments of education was complied by Buser and Humm in 1969.[43] Pearson and Fuller edited a volume, Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook (1969), that examined the 50 state education agencies.[44]

Colton conducted a study of more than a score of demonstration centers created by the Illinois Department of Education during 1963-65. In his report he reveals that Illinois used such devices as guidelines, contracts, consultants, training programs, conferences, and reports to influence local decisions. A survey of state records, state staff, and over 60 local personnel revealed widespread and conscientious attention to state policy.[45]

Bosley describes a Multi-State Teacher Education Project, a three-year program to add support to the role of state education agencies in developing shared responsibilities of local school agencies and teacher institutions for student teaching. This project demonstrated many types of leadership activities which can be carried out by state education agencies to improve teacher education. It is discussed in greater detail in Chapter III.[46]

A substantial number of doctoral theses have dealt with the histories of particular state education agencies, state boards, and chief state school officers. Notable among these is Garofalo's, in which is described initial operations of the Ohio State Board of Education as the state combined its boards into one election board with authority to appoint the chief state school officer.[47] Related to this study is Apgar's details of the growth of the state superintendent.[48]

In addition to doctoral dissertations, a number of state studies of education are also available. Ruff emphasized the expanding services of the state departments of education in the improvement of education with particular emphasis on Nebraska.[49] McCoy dealt with the expanding services and greater centralization effort in Pennsylvania.[50] Prince and Thomason studied the expanding services in the state education agencies in North Carolina and Alabama respectively.[51,52]

Several articles and studies have proposed stronger state education agencies for specific states. Brooks related basic guidelines for educational planning at the state level to the state education agencies in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio and Wisconsin, including a functional description of the planning process and its structure in state education agencies.[53] In 1968 the Alaska Department of Education recognized the need for a strengthened state education agency to coordinate educational activities of local districts and to develop a planning program.[54] In 1969 the New Mexico State Department of Education recommended a program similar to the Alaska one.[55] Carlson and Kiernan, in a proposal to the Massachusetts State Department of Education, recommended a unique communications network including collection, evaluation, and dissemination of information on new innovations in educational practices.[56]

Relatively few studies can be found which deal with the roles of state boards of education, chief state school officers, state education agencies, or of any state operations in the field of education. In its 1965 publication, Research Studies in Education, Phi Delta Kappa lists doctoral dissertations, reports, and field studies for the 1953-63 period. Included are fewer than a dozen studies, most of which are restricted to some special aspect in a single state.

Although Morphet says the state education agency, unlike any other similar agency, tends to continue doing what it was established to do, holding itself relatively stable and resisting attempts at restructuring, some recent studies have focused attention on new roles of the state education agencies to involve them more directly and aggressively in such leadership roles as research development and dissemination of instructional practices.[57] In view of the potentially significant role of the state in shaping educational policy, it is apparent that more fundamental and searching studies are needed.[58]

Wimpey sought to analyze the proper role of the state education agency and to determine the manner or extent to which it was discharged through the appraisal of state services by ninety-six elected state officials in Georgia. The appraisal techniques of this study were questioned, but the study revealed two distinct findings:

1. Local school officials were seeking more services than they were receiving;
2. Staff time devoted to educational services varied widely.[59]

The Outlook for State Education Agencies

In an introduction to his study, Beach states, "If state departments of education are to occupy their appropriate place and realize their full effectiveness in service to American society, it is essential that each state will answer for itself three basic questions:

1. What functions should be vested in the state department of education?
2. What services should the department render to discharge these functions?
3. How best may these services be provided?"[60]

While some general agreement to the answers of these questions has been achieved, researchers are still seeking answers and state agency personnel are still endeavoring to respond to these basic questions.

One relevant question concerns the extent to which local control of education should be curtailed in favor of state control. More generally, what should be the relationship between state and local education agencies? A superficial reading of the documents cited herein might lead one to conclude that local control was being eroded by the expanding services of state education agencies. A closer look indicates that the growth is in the area of state leadership and service, an area which heretofore had not received proper attention, and local control is not being diminished as a result. Hawk and Grieber, and Pierce and Rosenstengel substantiate this analysis.[61,62]

A later study done by Rich underscored this trend. His survey confirmed that state education agencies are placing less emphasis on inspection and more emphasis on improvement through cooperative action by state and local authorities.[63]

A model state education agency must step out of the traditional mold and examine the services it offers. These services should have relevance to the needs of local school systems. SEA services must be designed to assist local systems to respond successfully to new challenges by providing, directly or indirectly, expertise that is not available elsewhere. Such resource activities include, for example, advising, consulting, preparation of curriculum guides, and dissemination of statistical and other information possessed by the Department.

Since it is unlikely that state education agencies will be able to recruit and hold enough qualified personnel to carry out visitation--oriented programs, new approaches will have to be adopted. Conditions confronting the SEA in the general area of service activities require that the agencies evaluate their procedures and resources and adopt more efficient strategies for meeting their service responsibilities.[64]

Some problems confronting state education agencies are discussed by Sroufe. He points out that SEA's bear the responsibility for a multitude of activities and that they are finding numerous and creative ways to provide additional services to people within their state. He underscores the fact that state education agencies are not in every instance as effective as their multiple activities might seem to suggest. This he attributes to four constraints which hamper them from playing even more vital roles in each state's educational establishment.

1. Inadequate financial support
2. Lack of agreement on how to achieve maximum impact
3. Need for qualified personnel
4. Organizational inertia

Need for qualified personnel goes hand in hand with inadequate financial support. Greater financial resources will be required to help state personnel meet some of their most pressing needs. While it is pointed out that more money will not solve all of the problems, more funds would enable the agencies to expand their roles by hiring persons to perform important though still neglected tasks, to purchase materials, and to develop new and enlarged programs. Until the general fiscal condition of the states improves and state sources of revenue can keep pace with the demands for services, the state education agencies will not be able to discharge fully their assigned and assumed roles, and they will continue to be concerned primarily with fulfilling mandates of the statutes rather than identifying and dealing with new and more pressing areas of critical need.[65]

Morphet, Johns, and Reller cite an additional problem. Namely, a hesitancy to support strong state leadership in education. There are many people who give lip service to commonly accepted purposes of public education, but nevertheless have reservations about some of them. Furthermore, there are sharp differences of opinion about how educational purposes can be best achieved. At times this contributes to complications in developing a soundly conceived state education agency.[66]

Such skeptics make it difficult to impossible for the state agency to provide the leadership necessary to carry out its role of reassigning and reinterpreting purposes, conducting required studies, establishing suitable goals, and identifying appropriate policies and procedures for attaining them. Real difficulties are encountered in many states in getting an agreement on the need for an effective state education agency, establishing it on a sound basis, and clearly defining its role in terms of emerging needs.[67]

Another potential SEA problem is over-extending--taking on tasks which could appropriately be handled by another agency. One example is suggested by Morphet, Johns, and Reller. They question whether state education agencies should undertake basic research. In their opinion, this can be done better and more appropriately by universities or independent research agencies. The contention of these authorities is that the role of the SEA is to encourage such research and to seek to identify practical applications.[68]

The earlier discussion indicated that the leadership function in state education agencies is growing. The conditions associated with effective SEA leadership are discussed by Morphet, Johns, and Reller. They find leadership functions are discernible most often in those state education agencies where four essential elements are evident:

1. The chief state school officer who administers the agency provides the professional leadership necessary to improve the State program of education.
2. The professional staff is chosen by a means which guarantees not only that they are unquestionable leaders in their respective fields but also that they can work effectively with others in assessing and solving problems of education.
3. The agency is soundly structured and so effectively administered that smooth functioning is facilitated.
4. The taxpayers and the state legislature demand and support amply the type of centralized services that can be provided best through capable leadership in the state education agency.[69]

One of the best single treatments of the emerging role of state education agencies is in the volume, Strengthening State Departments of Education.[70] The authors maintain that state education agencies today are different from what they were several decades ago, and can be expected to change even more over the years that follow.

While to determine the emerging role of the state education agency means that one must move into the realm of speculation, this speculation can be based upon conditions which indicate the direction the development of the role of the state agency will take. Educational organizations change as do other organizations; they respond to technological and social changes by modifying their own patterns--by providing more, or fewer, or different services. State education agencies are organizations which have responded and must continue to react appropriately to new conditions if they are to be truly relevant to the educational enterprise. While state education agencies have been accused of not being prepared to respond to the present situation, they are not alone in this predicament. Local school districts and universities are also having problems in meeting new demands. This is not an easy task since numerous novel conditions are continuing to emerge.

In planning for future roles of state agencies, it must be recognized that many of the functions traditionally performed by SEA's may now be carried out by other organizations. Since there are alternative ways of providing for some of the functions previously performed, it becomes expedient for state agencies to select and order the functions they will seek to perform.

If SEA's are to be more than regulatory agencies they must evolve a more creative role in their relationships with the federal government. Their programs should not be determined by the availability of federal funds. State agencies ought to influence educational policy decisions at the federal level rather than remain continually as passive recipients of federal programs. SEA's are to be staffed so they can fully utilize federal funds, and so that they can assist school districts to utilize federal funds.

Within the states the inter-agency relationships of the state education agencies should be modified as well. It will become increasingly necessary for SEA personnel to work with other agencies, especially the departments of health, labor, and welfare. Thus, cooperative relationships help to articulate the programs of the SEA with the needs of the state, and may be facilitated by creation of liaison positions.[71]

Sroufe and Campbell also discuss the emerging role of state education agencies. They begin by identifying the new conditions which many state education agencies are facing today. They continue by discussing the new SEA role which is likely to emerge as a result of these conditions. Some of the conditions out of which the new roles will emerge are:

1. The increasing expectations which come from the growing feeling that education is critical to the resolution of the political, economic, and social problems of society.
2. The unmistakable signs that education is of increasing interest to people generally, as supported by the growing number of newspaper articles and editorials which proclaim the need for quality education.
3. The necessity for public officials at all levels of government to be constantly sensitive to the education issue because education has become politically relevant.
4. The demand of the public for accountability, for convincing evidence that resources allocated to the education processes have been utilized efficiently--that we are obtaining maximum educational value for each dollar expended.
5. The national assessment movement, which may eventually result in information about pupil achievement which is required to allocate scarce resources efficiently and apply resources wisely in the attainment of educational goals.

6. The increased activity of the federal government, which has been accused of determining the agenda of state education agencies. This becomes even more significant when it is understood that an estimated 50% of SEA professional personnel are supported by federal funds and are carrying out programs created and supported by federal legislation. Although this is not a responsibility the states have eagerly sought, they have, albeit reluctantly, accepted it.
7. The development of regional laboratories which are designed to carry out a research and development function for a wide geographical area, a function traditionally left to state education agencies, but one about which most SEA's have been able to do little.
8. The Education Commission of the States, which was designed to perform at least two important functions: to support research in areas of concern to the states so that educational policies based upon research findings might be developed and to provide a unified response to the increased role of the federal government in education. As these functions become operative, they will have important consequences for state education agencies.
9. The changeover of society, largely since 1900, from a predominantly rural and agrarian to a predominantly urban and industrial one.[72]

In summary, the social and educational conditions which Sroufe and Campbell see as pressing for a new role on the part of the state education agencies include greater expectations for education, demand for more rational decision-making, the increased role of the federal government, the establishment of regional laboratories, the emergence of the Education Commission of the States, and the urbanization of society. State education agencies must adapt to these conditions if they are to perform roles relevant to the educational system.

Chapter I Footnotes

[1] Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 243.

[2] Ibid., p. 245.

[3] Ibid., p. 234.

[4] Ibid., p. 235.

[5] Fred F. Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education (U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 12. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 1.

[6] William H. Roe, "State Regulations of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Robert L. Ebel (The MacMillan Company, 1969), p. 1304.

[7] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, p. 3.

[8] Truman M. Pierce, Federal, State, and Local Government in Education (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 49.

[9] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, p.ix.

[10] Ibid., pp. 3-16.

[11] Roald F. Campbell, Gerald E. Sroufe and Donald H. Layton (eds.), Strengthening State Departments of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1967), p. 9.

[12] William B. Rich, Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools: Responsibilities and Services of State Departments of Education (U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 36. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 28.

[13] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), p. 10.

[14] National Education Association, Committee on Tax Education and School Finance, Guides to the Development of State School Finance Programs (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1949), pp. 5-10.

[15] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, pp. 10-11.

[16] Morphet, Johns and Reller, p. 413.

[17] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), pp. 82-83.

[18] Morphet, Johns and Reller, p. 243.

[19] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), pp. 83-84.

[20] Morphet, Johns and Reller, p. 243.

[21] Pierce, pp. 48-49.

[22] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, pp. 4-9.

[23] Roe, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, p. 1301.

[24] Pierce, pp. 48-49.

[25] Council of Chief State School Officers, The State Department of Education (Washington, D. C.: National Council of Chief State School Officers, 1952), pp. 20-21.

[26] Ibid., p. 28.

[27] Ibid., p. 24.

[28] Ibid., p. 24.

[29] Ibid., p. 25.

[30] Ibid., p. 23.

[31] Council of Chief State School Officers, State and Local Responsibilities for Education (Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1968), pp. 28-38.

[32] Ibid., p. 45-47.

[33] Ibid., p. 47.

[34] Ibid., p. 47-48.

[35] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, p. 11.

[36] Morphet, Johns and Reller, p. 244.

[37] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), p. 10.

[38] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, p. 13.

[39] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), pp. 83-84.

[40] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, pp. 4-16.

[41] Ibid., pp. 4-16.

[42] Fred F. Beach and Robert F. Will, The State and Education: The Structure and Control of Public Education at the State Level (U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 23. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955).

[43] Robert L. Buser and William L. Mumm, "State Education Agencies: A Bibliography," Unpublished manuscript, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, July, 1969.

[44] Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (eds.), Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900 (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969).

[45] David L. Colton, "State Power and Local Decision-Making in Education," A Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February 8, 1969.

[46] Marious Peter Garofalo, "The Origin and Establishment of a State Board of Education in Ohio" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1958).

[47] Ibid.

[48] Wilbur E. Apgar, "Evolution of the Office of Chief State School Officer in New Jersey" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1958).

[49] George Otto Ruff, "The Development of State School Administration in Nebraska" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Nebraska, 1959).

[50] Eugene Mateer McCoy, "History and Development of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction to 1945" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1959).

[51] David Hyde Prince, "A History of the State Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina, 1852-1956" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of North Carolina, 1959).

[52] Jay Emmett Thomason, "The Development of the Administrative organization of the Public School System of Alabama" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Alabama, 1959).

[53] H. M. Brickell, Organizing New York State for Educational Change (Albany: New York State Department of Education, December, 1961).

[54] Alaska State Department of Education, Statewide Planning for Programs in Education, Alaska State Department of Education (Juneau: Alaska State Department of Education, 1968).

[55] New Mexico State Department of Education, Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project, Final Report (Santa Fe: New Mexico State Department of Education, 1969).

[56] Richard O. Carlson and Owen B. Kiernany, A Plan for Curriculum Innovation in Massachusetts (Boston: Massachusetts State Department of Education, 1966).

[57] H. M. Brickell, Organizing New York State for Educational Change (Albany: New York State Department of Education, December, 1961).

[58] Morphet, Johns and Reller, pp. 251-252.

[59] John Andrew Wimpey, "An Appraisal of State Educational Administrative and Supervisory Functions in Georgia" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1958).

[60] Beach, The Functions of State Departments of Education, p. ix.

[61] Richard D. Brooks, Comprehensive Planning in State Educational Agencies: A Rationale and Discussion of the Planning Function and Structure within State Education Agencies (Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1968).

[62] Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce and William Everett Rosenstengel, Public School Administration, (2 ed. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1961).

[63] Rich.

[64] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.), p. 85.

[65] Ibid., pp. 15-16

[66] Morphet, Johns and Reller, p. 251.

[67] Ibid., p. 251.

[68] Ibid., p. 253.

[69] Ibid., p. 244.

[70] Campbell, Sroufe and Layton (eds.).

[71] Ibid., p. 90.

[72] Ibid., pp. 77-81.

CHAPTER II. THE ROLE OF STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES APPLIED TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Chapter I described the general role of a state education agency (SEA). Stated in an oversimplified manner, that role is to see that the established state program of education is carried out. To accomplish this, the SEA assumes regulatory and leadership functions. At times, the agency also assumes operational functions.

Teacher education represents one of the areas in which the SEA functions are performed. It is, in fact, a major concern since personnel represents the most costly element in a typical program of formal education. Normally, the personnel cost exceeds 75% of the total program cost.

In addition to being the most costly element, the personnel element is the most difficult, from a management standpoint, to control. Teachers are human, so they reflect individual differences, just as do the pupils whom they teach. Uniform teachers cannot be manufactured as can school facilities or instructional materials. Instead, the schools must select those persons who are best qualified to perform as teachers and then to provide such additional training or assistance as is required to help them adapt to the needs of their pupils.

Generally speaking, the SEA's regulatory role in teacher education includes prescribing and administering minimum standards for selecting and training educational personnel. The SEA leadership role is to assist local school districts and other agencies in (a) identifying competencies which appear to contribute to pupil learning, (b) identifying training and evaluation procedures, and (c) obtaining resources to implement the necessary training programs. SEA operational activities in the area of teacher education are normally restricted to those which no other agency is prepared to carry out.

Historical Development

An historical account of the role of state education agencies in teacher education is essentially a history of state certification. The most detailed history of certification is by Kinney.[1] Historical accounts have also been prepared by LaBue[2] and Stinnett.[3]

The office of chief state school officer was created in all northern states and some southern states between 1830 and 1850. Initially, state education authorities focused their attention on financial considerations exclusively. However, as state education agencies were established, concerns went beyond finances. One result was a tendency toward centralization of the certification authority.

It is notable that, prior to 1825, no certification practices were in effect. Probable causes were a lack of central authority for education, a scarcity of applicants, and difficulties of communication and travel. Hence, there was no central authority for verifying that teaching candidates met minimum standards. Many local officials did develop teacher examinations which were used in selecting candidates. The major function of the examinations was to determine that candidates were not illiterate.

During the nineteenth century, with the examination established as the standard certification mechanism, certification became a county function. This trend was influenced by the need for competent examiners and by a desire of local officials to select candidates from a broader geographical area. The examinations continued to test basic elementary school subjects--i.e., basic literacy.

At the turn of the century, teaching certificates were issued by states, as well as counties, and local school districts. In almost all states, certificates were issued by both the state and the county. The move to state administration of certification resulted from many forces including improved travel and communication, and a better informed public concerned with the quality of teachers. Moreover, teachers desired certificates which were applicable across county lines.

Formal teacher training programs began in the nineteenth century as it came to be recognized that teachers require special training. In 1839, the first normal school was established to provide this training. Normal schools were designed to prepare elementary teachers. Later in the nineteenth century, a need for special preparation for secondary teachers was also recognized. This occurred as universities observed that many undergraduates were going into teaching and began providing special courses for teachers. In 1890, 114 higher institutions (out of 400) were offering courses planned for teachers.[4]

Around the turn of the century, changes were taking place in the schools. Curricula were becoming more complex with new subjects added and basic subjects expanded. This led to dissatisfaction with the validity of teacher examinations. Literacy alone was not a sufficient qualification for a teacher in the American school at the turn of the century. Hence, examinations were eventually abandoned as the sole basis for certification.

The centralization of the certification function in state education agencies took place during the first half of the twentieth century. Between 1898 and 1940, the number of states holding exclusive powers for issuing certificates within their boundaries increased from 3 to 42. In 1967, teacher certification had become almost exclusively the prerogative of state education agencies.[5] State control of certification carried with it state control of the content of teacher preparation programs. Through state certification, certain course titles or topics were prescribed. Institutions in turn based their program on courses bearing those titles or covering those topics.

It is only recently that leadership functions in teacher education began to be considered by state education agencies. Early, there was only a division of "certification" and that is all it did. Armstrong and Bosley give the following account:

> . . .It was the business of the state education agency to get the best possible certification requirements established and to administer them without favortism. If the head of the unit did this, he was regarded as a good civil servant worthy of a banquet and a gold watch when he retired. He had nothing to do with teacher education except to see to it that the transcripts matched the written requirements in a perfect overlay. What lay back of the transcripts was of no concern to him.[6]

In the mid 1940's, there was a movement to establish state advisory councils for teacher education. This involved personnel outside of the state education agency. The purpose for such involvement was "to get agreement on guidelines which could be used in deciding whether programs proposed by institutions would meet the spirit, if not the letter, of the certification requirements."[7] This led to the "approved program" idea which allowed institutional programs to be evaluated and teaching certificates to be awarded to all persons who successfully complete the program. Initially, the review of programs was a "paper evaluation." As this became questioned, the advisory councils recommended procedures for more thorough program evaluation, normally involving visiting committees.[8]

In the past two decades there have been various assaults on the predominant, state controlled, pattern of teacher education, and certification. Examples are the efforts of the Ford Foundation, as articulated by Woodring, to promote a system with a greater liberal arts emphasis,[9] the writings of Koerner which attack the goals of public education and call for a greater emphasis on the "basics",[10,11] and the writings of Conant calling for higher standards of academic achievement and greater autonomy for higher institutions.[12] All of these critics are outside the "establishment" and have encountered resistance from that "establishment." (Conant describes the educational establishment as comprising "organized school administrators, state department of education personnel, classroom teachers of various kinds, professors of education, and the executive staffs of such organizations as the School Boards Association and the Parent Teacher Association."[13])

In the last two or three years, the situation has changed. There is now ferment within the establishment. Most of the establishment groups are asking questions about teacher education and certification, and seeking alternatives. The groups most concerned with teacher education have set up working committees to study and recommend new approaches.

Internal Influences on SEA Role

The major internal influences on the SEA role in teacher education come from the persons responsible for carrying out that role--the chief state school officers and the directors of teacher education and certification. This section reviews references relating directly to those two groups.

Chief State School Officers

Reports issued by the Council of Chief State School Officers represent a useful source for gauging the opinions of the chief executives in state education agencies. The Council, in its 1952 explication of guiding principles for state education agencies,[14] makes separate statements on "inservice education functions" and "teacher education and certification." In inservice education, the Council assigns the SEA a leadership role, with implementation of inservice activities the responsibilities of others. The following principles are suggested:

> 1. The state department of education should provide leadership and source materials to encourage inservice training programs on local and regional levels within a state.
> 2. The state department of education should assume leadership in planning clinics, conferences, and workshops for groups such as administrators, supervisors, teachers, custodians, and bus drivers which need specialized skills and understandings.
> 3. The state department of education should seek the cooperation of teacher education institutions and other agencies in developing inservice programs.
> 4. The inservice education program within the state should place major emphasis on improvement of administrative and supervisory personnel.
> 5. Inservice education should be continuous and subject to constant evaluation in terms of the growth and satisfaction of participants.
> 6. The state department of education should utilize all available resources in providing a strong program of inservice education for its staff.[15]

In the area of teacher education, the Council charges SEA's with providing for an adequate supply of qualified teachers, with cooperating with professional groups to develop and approve general policies relative to teacher education curricula and standards, and with assisting institutions and school districts in improving their programs. The Council recommends that teacher certification be closely coordinated with teacher education. It asserts that the state education agency should be the sole authority for issuing teacher certificates within a state. It encourages cooperation with lay and professional groups in developing teacher certification standards and also endorses the development of comparable patterns of teacher education and certification among states, thus facilitating reciprocity.[16]

The Council expanded its statements in a 1954 publication entitled Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for Teacher Education.[17] Of all the literature reviewed, this document addresses itself most directly to the question of the present paper, namely, "What should be the role of state education agencies in improving teacher education?" The Council specifies three roles:

> 1. Improvement of institutional programs of preservice teacher education.
> 2. Improvement of provisions for inservice teacher education. . .
> 3. Encourages the recruitment and retention of an adequate supply of qualified teachers.[18]

Under preservice education, the discussion deals first with the planning function. It recommends that the state education agency assume the leadership in planning an effective statewide program of teacher education. However, this planning should be carried out with continual participation of all groups in the state who are concerned with the quality and size of the teaching force. It notes also that teacher education planning should not occur in isolation but should consider the relationships of teacher education with other aspects of public education.

The Council sees research as a necessary component of state leadership in teacher education. It recommends that this research be directed (i.e., aimed at specified problems) and conducted as a comprehensive, unified program. The research can be conducted both by units within the state education agency and by outside groups, under the leadership of the state education agency.

The Council also endorses the consultative function as a necessary element of SEA leadership in teacher education. This function involves providing specific information, technical assistance, directional leadership, and encouragement. Consultation can be provided by SEA personnel or by others with the necessary expertise. Consultants can be secured from both within and outside the state.

It is recommended that the SEA serve as the coordinating agency for colleges and universities as they develop, improve, and evaluate their teacher preparation programs. One aspect of this coordinating function is guideance which helps institutions respond to the teacher supply and demand situation and to special needs of the schools. The functions related to preservice education also include public relations. The SEA should help the general public, the education profession, and education policymakers to understand the needs and objectives of teacher education.

The report also contains a section on inservice education. It points out that continuing inservice education is an integral part of teacher education. It recommends that the state education agency coordinate efforts of all groups interested in inservice teacher education. The report places a special priority on the role of the SEA in developing inservice education programs to train personnel for leadership responsibilities in education.

The report charges SEA's to promote the use of national accreditation in their states. It also recommends that the SEA work with interested agencies in developing a selective recruitment program. Finally, it recommends that the SEA exercise leadership in finding the necessary financial support to aid able, but needy students.

A second Chapter in the report deals with "principles relating to state accreditation of institutions and programs for teacher education." It assigns to the SEA the responsibility for initial and continuing legal accreditation of all teacher preparation institutions and programs. The Chapter further makes the points that standards should be applicable to all institutions, that criteria should be applied uniformally, and that persons and groups concerned with teacher education should have a voice in determining and applying criteria.

The third Chapter deals with the role of the state in teacher certification. The conduct of certification is a state function; the legislature should assign broad general certification authority to the State Board of Education. Certification should be administered by one unit within the Department of Education. This unit should apply criteria uniformally to all candidates from all institutions. It recommends that teacher certification should be used as a means for improving standards in the teaching profession.

The Council of Chief State School Officers issued an updated position statement in 1968. However, the teacher education portion of this statement[19] does not differ significantly from the 1952-54 statements. In the inservice education area, the 1968 statement adds members of boards of education to the list of person about whom the state education agency should be concerned as it promotes inservice education. In certification, the 1968 statement makes the special point of recommending the elimination of highly specific requirements for teacher certification in favor of requirements which are more general. It does this by encouraging full adoption of the approved program approach. It also endorses elimination of college credit requirements for extending teaching certificates for persons holding the Masters degree. In the accreditation of teacher education programs, the 1968 position statement recommends extensive use of committees. It also endorses the use of national accreditation (by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) as a basis for state accreditation. In sum, the 1968 statement does not represent a change in role for the state education agency. Instead, it emphasizes certain policies which the Council had already endorsed.

In looking at the full set of statements by the Council, it is apparent that the state education agency is viewed as a key force in teacher education within each state. It is the sole regulatory agency. Moreover, its role is not limited to the regulatory functions. It is expected to provide a wide range of leadership activities and related services.

Professional Personnel in Teacher Education and Certification

Significant variations have existed and continue to exist between approaches to teacher education and certification adopted by the several state education agencies. Beach surveyed service areas in state education agencies in 1948-49. His report shows that staff time allocated to teacher certification is more than double that allocated to teacher education. He also shows that the man-months allocated teacher education/certifcation comprise about 2.6% of the workload in state education agencies throughout the country; the range was from .33% to 15.9%. The New York State Education Department surveyed policies and practices in the approved program approach to teacher education.[20] (The report is undated, but the survey appears to have been conducted in 1967-68.) This survey was made in conjunction with the Interstate Certification Project to provide common information on approved program practices in each state. The report shows that staffing of state teacher education/certification offices varies and that program approval practices vary. Frinks[21] conducted the most recent survey of teacher education/certification practices in state education agencies. His data show that annual budgets for teacher education and certification sections range from $20,000 to over 3 million dollars. The portion of the state education agency budget allocated for teacher education and certification sections rangesfrom .02% to 20.7%.

It is obvious that the size and status of the teacher education/certification staff, along with the fiscal support allocated, is a factor in determining the role which the state education agency will assume relative to teacher education and certification. More important, however, is the role concept of the agency and its personnel. Frinks surveyed state directors of teacher education to find out the approaches they are now taking and the changes they expect to make. He found that seven states are currently using an credit-course approach to certification, forty-two states are using a approved program approach, and one state is using a performance-based approach. Six states using a credit-course approach indicated that they expect to change from that position to an approved program approach, three within the next year or two. Of the thirty-eight states using approved programs, fourteen expect changes within that approach, six within the next year or two. Twenty-three states currently using an approved program approach anticipate moving toward performance-based criteria, twelve within one or two years.[22]

The membership of the National Assocation of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) comprises the personnel in state education agencies responsible for administering teacher certification and teacher education program approval. Documents emanating from this Association represent a consensus of the views of this key group.

The Association's major publication is a set of *Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education.*[23] These standards are similar to the early standards adopted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. However, the NASDTEC standards go into greater detail by specifying subject matter content in specialized teaching areas. This document asserts that the accreditation or approval process is a significant teacher education function of the state education agency. It sees each state education agency as functioning autonomously in the accreditation process. (Stinnett reports that all but six states are currently using state accreditation standards.[24]) The NASDTEC publication recommends that the state agency make use of advisory groups, base approval on specified criteria, and utilize visiting teams in the accreditation process. It also recommends that the Proposed Standards serve as the basis for accreditation.

The use of the Proposed Standards as a basis for state approval for teacher education was endorsed in a resolution of the Association adopted June 22, 1965.[25] However, a statement on "Accreditation of Teacher Education" issued in 1969 by the President of the Association indicated that the support for the Proposed Standards is not unanimous:

> The recommendations of NASDTEC have had widespread influence upon the policies and practices of the several states. However, it is apparent from our current discussions and review of state education policies and practices that our membership does not agree on a single approach or vehicle for approval of teacher preparation programs or institutions which prepare teachers. 26

This position was confirmed in a survey reported by Stinnett which showed only twelve states using the Proposed Standards.[27]

To summarize, professional staffs in teacher education and certification in state education agencies represent only a small portion of the total SEA staff. The literature suggests that they tend to concentrate on the regulatory aspects of their role. However, they do not see course credit analysis as the most effective way of performing this role. Most consider the approved program approach the preferable strategy for improving teacher education. However, agreement on the best basis for program approval has not been reached. Moreover, most state teacher education and certification personnel are anticipating changes in standards, criteria, or practices within the next few years.

Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

The major role of state education agencies in teacher education has been administering teacher certification and the approval of teacher education programs. Up to now, the power of state education agencies to influence teacher education has been an outgrowth of their certification authority.[28] A variety of literature dealing with these topics is available.

Appropriate Jurisdiction for Certification

The historical background presented earlier describes the transformation of teacher certification from a local function to a county function to a state function. Both the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification assert that certification is properly a state function.

Some writers advocate changes which would either limit or modify the role of the state education agency in teacher certification. Lieberman[29] proposes to limit the autonomy of states in establishing types of certificates. Rosner[30] and Smith[31] recommend extra-legal certification which represents higher standards of competency than those established by the states. Kinney[32] recommends extra-legal certification by the profession which should precede, rather than follow, state certification. The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards[33] recommends that the authority for certification and teacher education program approval be transferred from the state education agency and assigned to a board representative of the education profession. These proposals are discussed below in greater detail.

Lieberman[34] proposes national certification. However, he does not consider it necessary for teaching certificates to be issued by the federal government. He merely proposes to eliminate state autonomy in establishing types of certificates. He advocates that, to the maximum extent possible, certificates and certification should be identical from state to state. Lieberman contends that this is necessary to "clean up the chaotic mess" in which certification finds itself.[35]

Lieberman makes a second recommendation related to the state agency role. He suggests that extralegal "education specialty boards" be established to issue a type of national certification to candidates identified as superior teachers. It would not be necessary for an individual to hold such certification to be eligible for employment as a teacher. However, it is suggested that such recognition would enhance the quality of teaching and of education. In effect, Lieberman is saying that the state education agency certification function has not met the needs of public education.

Speaking for the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education, Rosner[36] advocates a similar type of extralegal certification administered by specialty boards. This certification would be superior to state certification. Candidates would undergo an examination (for which a $500 fee would be charged) and would then enjoy the benefits of a $3,000 annual salary incurment (one-half from federal funds and one-half from local funds). The examination system would be headed by a national commission of twenty members. Initially, it is proposed that twenty-five board examination centers be established, each of which would assess one hundred candidates per year. Smith, in a recent paper,[37] repeats the recommendation of Rosner and his Committee. Smith continues by pointing out that the development of competency standards for use by a specialty board "is not a job for the unsophisticated nor for those who have romantic ideas of what teachers can and should do."[38] He considers it undesirable for each state to work out its own set of basic skills and behaviors. Instead, he believes a national commission should review proposed skills and thus produce a catalog containing standards which could be applied by each state. To summarize, both Smith and Rosner would restrict the role of states in developing standards and in administering certification beyond the minimum level required for employment.

Kinney[39] like Rosner and Smith, distinguishes between the civil service function of certification and a professional licensure function. He characterizes present certification as a civil service process to regularize employment and remuneration from public funds. He sees professional licensure as a means for identifying persons who are properly prepared to teach. He sees licensure as a responsibility of the profession. Unlike Rosner, Smith, and Lieberman, Kinney sees licensure as preceding certification. He sees the state education agency issuing certificates only to candidates whose qualifications have been professsionally endorsed. Lieberman and Smith assign the state education agency the responsibility for assuring minimum standards; they expect extralegal agencies to grant recognition for advanced development.

Allen[40] recommends that the detailed regulatory activities associated with teacher certification should be transferred to other agencies within each state, presumably local school districts. Thus, the movement would be back toward decentralized teacher certification typical of the nineteenth century. However, the state education agency would assume a distinctive twentieth century role. It would concentrate on stimulating involvement by local school districts, professional organizations, and higher institutions in teacher education, with a balance of autonomy among these groups.[41]

The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) of the National Education Association has established professional autonomy as one of its major goals. This goal suggests that any policy making or discretionary authority regarding teacher certification or teacher education program approval shall be removed from the state education agency and assigned to a "professional standards board." A professional standards board is defined by NCTEPS as a "non-political, legally recognized agency (e.g., board, commission, or council) assigned responsibility for (a) developing requirements and policies governing accreditation of teacher education institutions, the issuance and revocation of licenses, and the assignment of personnel; and (b) conducting studies designed to improve standards of licensure, accreditation and assignment."[42] The professional autonomy movement implies that state education agencies should yield policy making authority to professional standards boards. However, the initial "Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards" proposed that the boards be advisory to their respective state education agencies.[43]

State education associations have been seeking legislation to establish professional standards boards. Eleven states had enacted such legislation by 1968.[44] A 1969 working paper of the National Education Association showed 16 states as having enacted professional standards legislation.[45] The 1969 paper also takes a stronger position on the independence of a professional standards board. The paper includes a "draft teaching profession act" which establishes a commission independent of the state education agency. This commission would assume the responsibilities for teacher certification and teacher education program approval commonly held by state education agencies. It should be noted that the professional standards boards established through 1969 seldom met the criteria for autonomy set forth in the draft legislation.

The argument for the professional standards boards makes the distinction between the control of education and the governing of the teaching profession. The 1969 paper agrees that lay boards of education at the state and local levels should continue to control education. The paper proposes that these boards should not have jurisdiction over the teaching profession. That is, the lay boards should not accredit teacher education institutions, and should not set and enforce standards for entry in, continuance in, and exit from the profession. It is proposed that the teaching profession should govern itself.

The writings reviewed in the preceding pages reveal a wide range of positions regarding the appropriate jurisdiction for teacher certification and teacher education program approval. They can be summarized as follows:

1. Complete autonomy on the part of each state in issuing teaching certificates.
2. Each state has full authority in determining whether or not candidates are eligible to receive certificates, but the types and classes of certificates available are determined by a national authority.
3. The certificates issued by each state are restricted to those representing minimum standards, while an extralegal agency issues certificates which recognize higher levels of competence.
4. The responsibility for determining teacher competence rests with an external agency (presumably the organized teaching profession or local education agencies); the state issues certificates to persons certified as competent by the external agency.
5. The state education agency is given no authority for issuing certificates or approving teacher education programs.

Standards for Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

There has been a good deal written regarding types of standards for teacher certification and teacher education program approval. In reviewing this literature, it is possible to consider at least three different dimensions along which standards can be analyzed: (a) the input-process-output dimension, (b) the level of specificity, and (c) the program content dimension. The present paper deals only with the first and second dimensions. The third dimension, program content, is extremely important, but is beyond the scope of this paper. It is more appropriately treated in papers dealing with topics such as "teacher role" and "research in teaching."

The remaining two dimensions represent vital strategy considerations and are uniquely related to the role of the state education agency in improving teacher education. For example, if it were determined that standards should be extemely specific and should focus on input criteria (i.e., institutional characteristics), the state education agency should have a team of inspectors assigned to collect information on the equipment, facilities, faculty qualifications, and admission criteria utilized by institutions or agencies which train teachers. On the other hand, if it were determined that standards should be specific, but should focus on output (teacher competency), it is possible that the state education agency should concentrate its efforts on an external examination program and disregard entirely the programs or conditions under which training is provided. A third possible condition might be one in which a very general set of standards is adopted. In this case, it might be advisable for state education agencies to minimize efforts to enforce standards and concentrate their attention on resource development, consultation, or other activities characteristics of a leadership approach to improvement, rather than a regulatory approach.

The Input-Process-Product Dimension

"What should be regulated?" is the major question relative to the regulatory role of the state education agency in teacher education. Should the state seek to assure that the programs in which teachers are trained have the desirable prerequisite conditions (i.e., inputs)? Should the state seek to assure that the training processes to which teachers and teaching candidates are subjected have certain desirable characteristics? Or should the state focus on the competencies or other characteristics which teachers are expected to possess, and not be concerned about the manner in which those competencies were developed?

The trend, from the beginning of certification in the nineteenth century to the 1970s, appears to be as follows:

- Product standards (early use of examinations in the elementary subject fields) to
- Process standards (certification on the basis of college credits completed) to
- Input standards (accreditation approach using traditional accreditation practices) to
- Process standards (accreditation approach emphasizing "qualitative" standards) to
- Product standards (performance-based teacher education movement).

Of course, the above statements represents a "smoothed curve." There has been considerable overlap between the use of the three types of standards. Currently, all three types are being used in varying degrees by different states in different situations.

There is variance among the types of measurement or auditing techniques which can be used with each type of standard. All types require some sort of checklist with which an analyst or evaluator can determine if the standard is met. For input standards, the judgment is usually objective and the checking is a clerical process. For process standards, the items may or may not be objective. If the process standard requires a record of successful course completion, the responsibility of the state education agency is merely to review official documents (e.g., transcripts) to verify course completion. This is a clerical task for the state, since all professional judgments are made by the institution or agency offering the courses. If, on the other hand, the state is responsible for periodic onsite evaluations of processes used, sophisticated professional judgment is required. Likewise, in the case of product criteria, there is a point where sensitive professional judgment is required. Whether or not this judgment will be made by the state education agency depends upon the system of competency measurement which is adopted.

As discussed earlier, teacher certification was brought into the world with examinations (i.e., product measures). The reasons for subsequently abandoning examinations and substituting evidence of college preparation (i.e., process measures) were summarized in the discussion of historical development. The abandonment was related to changes which were taking place in the schools requiring greater professional expertise on the part of teachers. The desired teacher competencies could not be measured adequately with available examinations. Kinney, drawing information from several sources, sets forth in greater detail the objections to the early examinations:

> 1. Certification through college credits hastens the elevation of teacher preparation much more than certification through examination.
> 2. Certification through college credits provides more assurance of systematic study by the applicant.
> 3. Minimum requirements are usually lower for certification by examination than by college credits.
> 4. Certification by examination offers minimum stimulus to improvement in service.
> 5. Certification by examination leads to unfair competition with those who have institutional preparation.
> 6. Examinations in subject matter are undependable in predicting teaching success.
> 7. Success in the teacher preparation program is a more reliable criterion for predicting success than is achievement on teacher examinations.
> 8. The administration of examinations becomes increasingly cumbersone as the number of teachers required increases...
> 9. Undesirable local pressure for unmerited certification is often exerted when abuses in examinations are possible.[46]

The transition from process standards to input standards (i.e., institutional characteristics) is marked by the first uses of the "approved program" approach, probably in the 1950s. Shearouse[47] cites Georgia as the first state to adopt this approach. This development, like the earlier adoption of the "college credit" approach, is attributable to a concern for improving the quality of teacher preparation. It was recognized that a course title and grade on a transcript from one institution may not represent a training experience equivalent to a course with the same title and grade on a transcript from another institution. One solution to this problem was to review program characteristics (i.e., inputs). This approach, with precedent in the domain of academic accreditation, is based on the assumption that a program with distinguished professors, commodious facilities, sound financial support, extensive library holdings, and carefully selected students will produce effective teachers. The proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education which have been adopted by the National

Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification[48] (discussed earlier) served as a basis for the standards for program approval or accreditation adopted by many states. The following is an outline of topics treated in a portion of those standards:[49]

1. Purposes and objectives
2. Organization and administration
   a. board of control
   b. general administration
   c. finances
   d. extended services
3. Student personnel programs
   a. organized counseling
   b. supporting student services
   c. data on teacher supply and demand
   d. adequate student records
4. Admission policies
   a. admission to the institution
   b. admission to teacher education
5. Faculty
   a. faculty competence
   b. service load of faculty
   c. instruction
6. Facilities and instructional materials
   a. buildings and grounds
   b. library
   c. laboratories
   d. curriculum laboratories
   e. laboratory schools

As might be expected, various observers have become suspect of input standards as a primary criterion. This has brought a trend back toward process and product criteria. In fact, since the inception of the approved program approach, the literature does not show that the swing to input characteristics was complete. Instead, the last twenty years has been a period of experimentation with both process standards and product standards in regulating teacher education and certification, but without abandoning the input standards which characterize the traditional academic accreditation.

The development of a type of process standards different from the transcript records used earlier is associated with the concern for "qualitative" measurement in the field of accreditation. Mayor[50] discusses "Qualitative versus Quantitative Measurement of Excellence in Teacher Education." He acknowledges weaknesses of various quantitative measures and discusses types of information which can be collected. He gives major attention to more sensitive measures of institutional characteristics (i.e., inputs) such as seriousness of purpose, the distinctive role of the institution, the selection of students within the framework of institutional purpose, balance, and atmosphere of intellectual ferment. He also discusses product measures such as performance of graduates on standardized tests.

Pendergraft[51] discusses the process versus the product issue. His definition of "process" appears to include both the input standards and the process standards described in the present paper. He concludes that "the accreditation of teacher education should be based on the evaluation of both the process of preservice teacher education and the quality of the product of the program. To neglect the appraisal of either results in inadequate understanding and, justifiably, lessens confidence in the accreditation procedure.[52]

The current standards used by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)[53] have moved away from the absolute quantitative input standards and relate input measures to their uses. An example is the library standard which reads, "The library is adequate to support the instruction, research, and services pertinent to each teacher education program."[54] The standards do not mention the number of books required, the square feet of floor space, or the seating capacity.

Notably, the new standards also include a section on the evaluation of graduates. This first attempt at product criteria is a new feature for NCATE.

The strongest process emphasis in the NCATE standards is found in the curriculum section. In each of the components--professional studies, teaching specialty, humanistic and behavioral studies, laboratory experiences, practicum, and general studies--the evaluator is asked to collect evidence on the manner in which the standard is actually implemented. For example, the laboratory experience standard specifies that "the professional studies component of each curriculum includes the systematic study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory and clinical experience."[55] The evaluator is expected to collect information on the manner in which this occurs.

To summarize the discussion of process criteria, two approaches have been used. One is to assume that transcript information represents the processes which have taken place in a teacher education program and to compare the transcript information with the course credit criteria which have been pre-established. The second method is to use the accreditation approach in which one or more knowledgeable persons make an onsite observation of processes which are taking place and compare these with certain process criteria.

With the first approach, transcript review, the state education agency relies on the judgment of the institution as to whether the processes are adequate. Thus, the persons most knowledgeable about the situation make a judgment over an extended period of time. This judgment, which may lack objectivity, is simply accepted by the state education agency. Smith has spoken out against "taking the word of a university official that the criteria have been satisfied." He asserts "that training institutions cannot be persuaded to reform their programs by specifying criteria for certification as long as these same institutions are themselves allowed to decide whether or not their products meet the criteria."[56]

With the second approach, the accreditation visit, the state education agency makes an independent evaluation. This approach to applying process criteria has potential for eliminating the bias which might be expected when institutional officials are asked to evaluate their own programs. However, it carries with it the possibility that the outside visitors will observe an inadequate sample of the institutional processes. Furthermore, since process criteria are the most difficult to objectify, multiple interpretations of the same data are apt to result.

To many, product standards seem to be the answer. This seems ironic since it brings the teacher certification movement full circle to where it began. Moreover, the current product standards movement is not free from the problems which beset the original teacher examinations and led to their abandonment.

One issue is the aspect of the product which should be measured. Schalock[57] offers three options in assessing the products of teacher education programs. There is the traditional practice of measuring the knowledge which has been mastered, as was done in the original teacher examinations. There is also the possibility of measuring teaching performance--the proficiency with which a teacher demonstrates the skills or behaviors which he is expected to have mastered. There is also the possibility of assessing the effects the teacher has on pupils--whether or not he can induce pupils to learn. Schalock's bias is toward the latter type of standard. Richard L. Turner, in an Appendix to Rosner's report,[58] treats the same issue as Schalock and suggests six levels of criteria:

1. Under criterion level one information is collected on the behavior (performance) of the teacher in the classroom and also on the pupil outcomes which are associated with that performance. This two-part appraisal of teacher performance is conducted over an extended period, probably two years (on a sampling basis).
2. Criterion level two is the same as criterion level one except the performance period is shorter.
3. Under criterion level three information is collected on the behavior (performance) of the teacher in the classroom. (No pupil outcome data are collected.)
4. Under criterion level four information on teacher behavior (performance) is collected in a restricted situation, such as a microteaching setting.
5. Under criterion level five information on teacher behavior (performance) is collected in a simulated situation (probably without live students).
6. Under criterion level six information is collected on the teacher's understanding of behavior, concepts, or principles germane to teaching. (The teacher does not actually demonstrate, but explains, answers questions on a test, or provides other appropriate evidence.)

The product standards now in use in teacher certification and teacher education program approval are primarily the knowledge type in Schalock's classification, or criterion 6 (or beyond) in Turner's classification. Currently, twenty-one states use some type of proficiency examination in the certification process.[59] The most widely used tests are the National Teacher Examinations (NTE) and the Modern Language Association (MLA) Examinations for Teachers and Advanced Students. Only two states --North Carolina and South Carolina--require the NTE for certification of applicants holding degrees from teacher education programs. Other states use the NTE to validate degrees from non-accredited institutions. Several states require teacher education institutions to administer the NTE to all graduating seniors primarily to evaluate preparation programs. In some states, college proficiency examinations, including the MLA, are used as an alternative route to certification.

Mosier[60] generally advises against the use of examinations as a sole criterion for teacher certification. Like those who worked to eliminate the original teacher examinations, Mosier does not believe that the many necessary competencies for teaching can be detected through examinations.

Medley[61] discusses the possibility of a new type of teaching examination. It would be modular in construction, allowing for candidates and potential employers to select the modules which they consider important. He suggests 42 possible modules including such things as "mechanics of English", "knowledge of Chicano culture", "skill in asking questions", "teaching judgment", "use of technological aides", "maintenance of classroom environment", and "awareness of current educational trends." Obviously, this would not be a traditional paper-and-pencil examination. Medley proposes three item formats: verbal, audiovisual, and situational.

Medley's examination covers only criteria four, five, and six in Turner's classification system. However, it may represent a first approximation of the kind of examination which the "educational specialty boards" proposed by Rosner[62] and Smith[63] would administer. Medley's examination certainly represents a serious attempt to overcome the shortcomings of traditional teacher examinations.

It is, of course, possible to employ product criteria without using external examinations. The State of Florida[64] and the State of Washington,[65] both of which are attempting to implement performance-based teacher certification, have encouraged teacher training agencies to develop training programs employing performance criteria. In developing such programs, the agencies will specify the competencies which they expect teachers to master, specify the manner in which they will assess mastery, and devise the necessary training procedures. Both states employ an approved program approach. Program standards are being developed which will allow programs to be approved when the above conditions have been met. The procedures being followed in these states are treated in greater detail in Chapter III.

In reviewing this discussion of input-process-product standards, the total sequence of efforts can be depicted as a crusade. The crusaders have been searching for standards which will assure effective teachers for public schools. Three types of standards--results from formal examinations, records of academic work completed, and analyses of institutional characteristics--have been tried. The examinations were abandoned because the technology for measuring significant teacher competencies was not available. The transcript analysis lost favor because the same words and symbols on different transcripts represent different levels of excellence. The analysis of institutional characteristics has been questioned because the relationship between institutional traits and traits of persons trained in those institutions is uncertain.

Currently, state education agencies are taking a more tolerant attitude toward variations in teacher preparation content and practices. The crusade to discover valid and practical standards is continuing. The searchers are looking toward more sensitive process measures and more sophisticated product measures.

Specificity of Standards

It is obvious that a strong interactive relationship exists between the specificity dimension and the input-process-product dimension. In general, specificity has been advocated when standards focus principally on input variables, flexibility (i.e., lack of specificity) is encouraged when process standards are used, and specificity is desired when product standards are used.

Generally speaking, there are three strands of literature which relate to specificity of standards. One is the reciprocity writings emanating from pens of those wishing to facilitate the movement of teachers across state lines. A second strand grew out of the teacher education study by Conant and includes those in New York State who set out to implement the Conant ideas. The third strand can be found in the performance-based or competency-based teacher education movement currently developing.

Loosely defined, reciprocity means that a teacher eligible for certification in a given state is also eligible for certification in other states without having to meet additional requirements. While flexibility of standards is often posed as a means for achieving reciprocity, it should be noted that uniform standards represent the most efficient means for achieving reciprocity. If each state were to agree to eliminate any certification requirement which is not acceptable to every other state, reciprocity would be automatic.

The approved program approach is universally considered to be the most acceptable route to reciprocity. However, agreement has not been reached as to the best basis for program approval. Three approaches have been advocated. The first is to recognize the quality of an institution accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and accept NCATE graduates for certification. This approach has been advocated by Armstrong[66] and others. In 1970, forty states reported some use of NCATE in determining eligibility for certification.[67]

Program approval on the basis of the Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education[68] has been advocated by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. However, as reported earlier, a majority of the members of the Association are not making use of those standards. Stinnett reports their use in only twelve states[69] and their effects on reciprocity are not clear. It should be noted that the Proposed Standards represent a rather specific set of program approval criteria.

A third approach to reciprocity is provided by the Interstate Reciprocity Compact.[70] This compact developed under a federally supported ESEA Title V (Section 505) project. Twenty-three states were reported as participants in 1970.[71] The reciprocity procedures begin with the enactment of enabling legislation in each state. Contracts are then negotiated between the participating states as authorized in the legislation. The contracts represent bilateral agreements between pairs of states. Hence, each state reviews the program approval practices of other compact states and determines those with which agreements will be signed. The Interstate Compact provides a means by which states wishing to promote interstate movement of teachers may negotiate with each other. A set of flexible standards may be helpful in negotiating with other states, provided that the flexibility does not extend to the point at which other states lose confidence in the credibility of the standards.

The second strand of literature related to flexibility grew out of Conant's address, "Teacher Certification: The Restricted State-Approved Program Approach."[72] Conant is dissatisfied with regulatory practices in teacher education. He considers NCATE unacceptable, the "prescribed exposure scheme" unacceptable, and the state-approval approach as not significantly different from the "prescribed exposure scheme." He recommends the university faculty as the most plausible place to turn for responsible control of teacher preparation. He advocates state acceptance of the university-based postion of the teacher education program which is proposed by a university faculty. Thus, he advocates significant increases in the flexibility of state standards. Conant does, however, advocate required state approval for a portion of the program; namely, practice teaching. He recommends that the scrutiny of the state for program approval be restricted to the practice teaching portion of the program.

The Danforth Foundation and the New York State Legislature provided funds for a three-year project to implement the Conant ideas in the State of New York. The Five College Project[73] was initiated to devise teacher education programs free from state restrictions. Each participating institution was guaranteed that the state certification office would invoke no penalties on their graduates when they apply for certification.

While the colleges were given complete flexibility in deciding what constitutes an adequate preparation program,there were some constraints: (a) Program decisions must be made by a committee composed of representatives from academic fields, as well as pedagogical fields. (b) The liberal arts approach should be dominant throughout the four years. (c) Initial professional requirements should be held to a minimum.[74]

The evaluation of the project indicated that the flexibility granted did not detract from the quality of preparation:

> Judging by contemporary evaluative standards, the programs developed by the all-university process are of the same or better quality and have faculty and administrative interests and commitment no less than that of the former teacher education programs on these campuses.[75]

It was also observed that granting flexibility may not bring about significant change in teacher preparation programs. Additional encouragement is needed.

Lierheimer, who was associated with the Five College Project, has recently written about the futility of prescriptive standards for state certification. He is looking toward the day when performance standards administered by local school districts will be established. His advise on current certification practices is to "Give Up the Ship Because it is Sinking!"

> Until such time as performance standards for teachers are developed and tried out, certification should be granted solely on the recommendation of an approved higher institution. Transients who were not a graduate

> of a particular institution could apply to a state approved institution and be evaluated for a certificate. [76]

In another article Lierheirmer writes, "Certification must be kept as flexible as possible in order to accommodate all persons with the ability to intervene creatively in the lives of students."[77]

The third strand of literature related to specificity is the performance-based or competency-based teacher education movement. This movement implies specificity. Its implications for specificity are stated by Massanari:

> The concept "performance-based teacher education" connotes a program designed explicitly and specifically to provide the prospective teacher with learning experiences and instruction that will prepare him to assume a a specified teaching role. Successful completion of the program is accomplished when, and only when, the teacher candidate demonstrates that he is competent to assume the role for which he has prepared; that is, he must provide satisfacotry evidence, not only that he possesses specified requisite knowledge, but also that he can carry out in practice specified teaching tasks and functions. It is the degree of specificity and explicitness in program design and in competence to be demonstrated that tends to distinguish performance-based programs from traditional programs. [78]

It may seem ironic that Lierheimer advocates flexibility in standards, and at the same time advocates performance-based teacher education. Possibly, he is endorsing flexibility at the state level to allow for multiple options at the local level or institution level, where specificity will be applied in each program.

At its present state of development, it is best not to speculate on the implications of performance-based teacher education for certification. While there is not doubt that performance-based teacher education requires specific standards, the point at which those standards should be applied is not clear: (a) It is possible that different standards could be established for different individuals within a given program. (b) It is possible that uniform standards could be applied to all persons completing a given program within an institution. (c) Likewise, it is possible to adopt statewide performance standards. (d) If the specialty boards proposed by Rosner[79] and Smith[80] are established, national performance standards would be implemented.

The following points can be made in summarizing the literature related to specificity of standards. In the first strand of literature, flexibility (i. e., lack of specificity) has been advocated as an aid to reciprocity. However, it is standardization, not flexibility, that makes reciprocity possible. Nevertheless, it may be less difficult to achieve "standardization of flexibility." In the second strand of literature, Conant advocates restricting state standards to those applicable to practice teaching programs. He wants university faculties to have a great deal of flexibility in developing teacher education programs. Experience in New York State indicates that such flexibility is not harmful. In the third strand of literature, it is recognized that the performance-based movement requires specificity in standards. However, the literature does not stipulate the level at which the specific standards must be applied.

Regulation of Inservice Education

The preceding several pages may appear to relate primarily to preservice teacher education. This is because the regulatory responsibility of most state education agencies is focused on preservice teacher education--on determining who is eligible for initial employment. There are two ways, however, that inservice education has been integrated into the traditional regulatory role. One relates to requirements for renewing or extending teaching certificates; the other relates to qualifying for higher or advanced levels of certification.

Typically, additional academic work taken either for renewing a teaching certificate or qualifying for a higher certificate has followed the same basic pattern common in preservice teacher education. The major difference is that, in many cases, the work has been completed either in the summer or during the academic year but outside of the regular school day.

Obviously, the options in administering regulations which apply to preservice teacher education also apply to inservice education when offered in the same mode. That is, the same considerations regarding input-process-product and level of specificity are pertinent. This description includes the fifth-year requirement for continuing teacher certification. With this requirement, each teacher who is granted an initial certificate is expected to complete a program, normally equivalent to one year of advanced work, within a specified period of time. Twelve states have such a requirement.[81]

The application of performance standards for teacher certification certainly holds strong implications for inservice teacher education. Criteria of *levels one* and *two* proposed by Turner[82] require a school setting for their application. Criterion *level one* also requires an extended period of time (two years). If criterion *level one* were applied, it would no doubt be with inservice teachers. If the results of the teacher evaluation were brought to bear on the training of the persons assessed, it would surely be in inservice education.

Lierheimer[83] recommends an approach to teacher certification wherein initial certification is based on completion of an approved program and continuing certification is based on performance criteria applied locally. He envisions a differentiated staffing arrangement with one staff category being "teacher trainer". The teacher trainer will have the responsibility of evaluating the performance of teachers. Presumably, he will also prescribe appropriate training procedures to improve performance levels. Such training would no doubt take place in an inservice setting. When performance standards are met, the teacher trainer would attest to the state education agency that the standards for a higher level of certification have been met.

There are, of course, numerous inservice education courses, workshops, or other activities conducted outside of the certification framework. Thus, the regulatory role of the teacher education or certification staff in the state education agency does not affect such activities. However, they are affected by the general leadership activities of the SEA in teacher education. This is dealt with more extensively below.

It seems probable that a number of states have adopted new approaches to inservice education which are compatable with their respective structures for certification and teacher education program approval, but which do not rely exclusively on course work taken for college credit. Florida's program[84] is an example. Others were not found in the literature.

In Florida, the program approval approach is applied to inservice education programs conducted by local school districts. The standards employed require that inservice education needs be identified in terms of the educational program offered by the school district. Also, specific objectives and specific procedures for evaluating the attainment of objectives must be stated for most inservice activities. There is no fixed length for inservice activities, which may range from a few hours to a multi-term university course. Inservice activities may be offered by a school district independently, by school districts jointly with a higher institution, by a higher instituion, or by another appropriate agency. Academic credit is not required. A teacher who participates satisfactorily in an approved district inservice education program may have his teaching certificate extended.

To summarize, the traditional SEA regulatory structure for teacher education is directly applicable to traditional types of inservice programs. As new types of inservice programs are developed, new types of regulatory procedures will be required (if regulation remains the general strategy). An example of one new approach is the application of program approval procedures in non-credit non-university based inservice education programs.

Literature on the SEA Leadership Role in Teacher Education

This section treats literature which bears directly on the leadership role of the state education agency in teacher education. It is shorter than the preceding section because available literature is less extensive. In fact, if this paper had been written six years ago, there would be nothing to report in this section.

USOE Sponsored Conferences

The U. S. Office of Education has sponsored three national conferences dealing with the leadership role of state education agencies in teacher education from which publications resulted.

The Seattle Conference

The Seattle Conference, held in 1967, dealt directly with the topic "The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education."[85] The report of the Conference contains much which is relevant to the subject of the present paper. The overriding themes of the conference were three: (a) State education agencies should go resolutely about improving teacher education. (b) Certification or other regulatory activities are not likely to accomplish this. (c) State education agencies should establish working partnerships with higher institutions and local school districts to improve teacher education.

The publication, among other things, emphasizes the importance of inservice education. Hill[86] cites the need for making inservice education meaningful. He suggests that state education agencies take the lead, working with the teacher associations, school administrators, school boards, and teacher preparation institutions. Mayor[87] recommends that SEA's develop a plan for continuing education of teachers which includes regular leaves of absence for study (with no loss in pay). Hite[88] describes a state-initiated program which provided greater inservice education for beginning teachers. The program included nine different projects which were cooperatively undertaken. Ross[89] describes an approach taken in the State of Washington in which a beginning teacher is expected to complete a one year planned program of advanced study during his first five years of teaching.

Stone[90] describes two strategies which a state education agency might use in improving teacher education: the first is by legislation (or regulations) and the second is by providing venture capital. Metaphorically, the two approaches represent the stick and the carrot. He presents a brief case study on each: California's experience with the Fischer Act represents the legislation approach and the Ford Foundation's $70 million effort in teacher education reform the venture capital example. Stone cites the legislative approach as mostly ineffective and the venture capital as potentially effective. He recommends eliminating the staff which currently handles detailed administration for teacher certification and teacher education program approval and substituting a leadership team with access to venture capital. The capital can be used as seed money to finance special projects, awards or special citations, publications, incentives to school districts, research efforts, or consulting teams.

As noted earlier, several writers, including Stone, decry the continued use of regulation. Hill[91] asserts that the SEA which places its major emphasis on regulation "is literally wasting its substance and guaranteeing its ineffectiveness." Rackley and Miller[92] say that "the preparation of teachers cannot be improved by manipulating detailed course and credit requirements in the state capitol." Mayor[93] contends "that a state department which still counts credits for certification in 1966 is not unlike the housewife who still does her washing with a washboard." Allen[94] recommends that "state policies which effectively eliminate detailed state staff evaluation of college transcripts as a basis or procedure for teacher certification are an obvious need."

On the whole, the consultants and speakers at the Seattle Conference were dissatisfied with the traditional regulatory role of state education agencies in teacher education. This is particularly significant since the group included persons who were currently or formerly SEA officials. This conference was perhaps an early manifestation of the ferment which is now extant within state education agencies regarding the most appropriate SEA role in improving teacher education.

The Baltimore Conference

A USOE sponsored national conference on "The Role of the State Education Agency in the Development of Innovative Programs in Student Teaching" was held in Baltimore in 1968.[95] The report provides a great deal of information on innovative programs in student teaching. It deals with the role of the state education agency only indirectly. In the final chapter, the following conclusions related to the SEA role are drawn by Edelfelt:

1. State support in money, personnel, and commitment must be given to both schools and colleges. A state support formula will need

to be worked out so that schools which engage in teacher education can afford to assign personnel and time to the teacher training program.

2. State planning and standards for practicum experiences must be worked out by the agencies and institutions which have responsibility for teacher education. Such planning should include a specificiation of the commitments required of schools and colleges.

The Miami Conference

In 1970, a conference on "Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel" was held in Miami Beach. The publication resulting from this conference[96] contains statements from eleven states summarizing their anticipated activities for moving toward performance-based teacher education and teacher certification. The state teams preparing these statements were composed of representatives of the state education agencies, higher institutions, elementary and secondary schools, and professional organizations. The states participating were selected from those which indicated a prior commitment to move toward performance-based teacher education and teacher certification. Thus, the reports in the publication characterize the state leadership posture which can be found in some of the more change-oriented states.

Most states indicated that they would set up a working committee if they had not already done so. Also, most had plans for general dissemination. Many planned state or regional conferences. Some projected an analysis of their present laws or regulations and anticipated recommending changes. Some had established, or were considering, pilot projects. It is notable that no state proposed immediate changes in laws or regulations which would then be used to coerce changes in teacher education programs.

The Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-Step)

From 1966 to 1969, the U. S. Office of Education supported a seven-state project to strengthen the capabilities of the state education agencies for exercising leadership in teacher education. A major concern was the development of joint responsibilities for professional laboratory experience. The participating states were Florida, Maryland, Michigan, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia. A number of publications resulted from the project. The major documents are two volumes entitled Teacher Education in Transition.[97,98] Volume One describes the state leadership activities undertaken in the project.

Teacher Education Centers

Maryland and West Virginia established pilot school-based teacher education centers. Each center had a policy-making committee with representatives from the participating school districts, the participating higher institution(s), and the state education agency. There was a resident coordinator in each center who was a joint appointee of the local school district and the cooperating university. These centers represent a significant step in the evolution of programs for professional laboratory experiences. The traditional arrangement, of course, is one in which an institution assigns student teachers to a participating school and provides some coordination, without establishing a true partnership in terms of program development and evaluation. The M-Step centers represent serious efforts to establish partnerships.

A further step in this evolution would be the establishment of teaching complexes as advocated by Smith and his associates in Teachers for the Real World.[99] The concept of teaching complexes was tested in a series of projects supported by the U. S. Office of Education,[100] but apparently without involvement of state education agencies. The most recent recommendations in this line are from the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education which advocates the establishment of one-hundred "training laboratories" over the next five years. It is proposed that state education agencies have a role in planning and establishing these training laboratories.[101]

As the foregoing illustrates, the M-Step project and subsequent activities have proposed participation in consortiums for teacher training as a viable leadership role for state education agencies. Armstrong and Bosley[102] assert that real partnerships between schools, institutions, and state education agencies are essential for progress. Daniel[103] agrees with the need for collaboration, but questions the feasibility and desirability of state education agency participation in the operation of consortiums for teacher education. Instead, he suggests that the state agency should assist consortiums in policy development, should promote communications between consortiums and related programs, and should provide technical assistance to consortiums.

The State of Washington also established field-centered teacher education programs under M-Step. The Washington programs were conceived and implemented by groups representing local education agencies, higher institutions, and professional organizations. The addition of the professional organization as a consortium participant was a distinctive contribution of the Washington project. The Washington project also attempted to articulate preservice and inservice teacher education and, from this standpoint, was a sequel to an earlier project[104] which was organized by the state education agency to help beginning teachers perform more effectively. The role of SEA personnel in implementing field-centered teacher education programs under Washington's M-Step Project was one of consultant and catalyst, rather than operational partner. (This contrasts with the role assumed by the state education agency in the Maryland and West Virginia projects.)

The Michigan M-Step Project was designed to implement a state-wide pattern of organization for improving student teaching. A state-wide "reaction panel" was established to advise the state education agency on the activities related to M-Step. It was determined that a single state-wide organization for coordinating professional laboratory experiences would not be practical. Therefore, a regional approach was adopted with six regional councils. The state M-Step objectives, to be implemented by regional organizations, were as follows:[105]

1. To establish regional organizations for the coordination of laboratory experiences in teacher education.
2. To develop cooperative agreements among local education agencies and teacher training institutions as to the nature and extent of the student teaching experience.
3. To establish regional minimum standards for the selection of:
    a. Local school supervising teachers
    b. Cooperating schools
    c. College supervisors
4. To encourage interinstitutional cooperative structures among teacher education institutions.
5. To encourage experimental preservice and inservice teacher education programs among local schools, colleges, and universities.

The role of the state education agency in the Michigan M-Step project was similar to the Washington role: to serve as a catalyst and consultant. The SEA representatives brought the groups together, provided them with needed information, and secured consultative help where needed.

Developing Materials

The South Carolina M-Step Project concentrated on the development of materials for improving teacher education. These materials were of two types: educational television programs and printed materials. The television programs were designed for use on closed or open circuit television, or on portable video equipment for inservice or preservice teacher education. These programs were produced using the extensive educational television facilities in South Carolina. The programs included ten videotapes concerned with significant aspects of student teaching.

The second type of product, printed materials, included guides for use with the video presentations. There was also a handbook for student teaching. In addition, the state conducted conferences and related dissemination activities using the materials produced, as well as outside resources. Thus, the state education agency role in the South Carolina M-Step project included both producing teacher education resources and disseminating them for use.

The Utah M-Step project bears some similarities to both the Washington and the South Carolina project. Utah produced printed and video materials for teacher education. The video materials differ from the South Carolina materials in that they were produced with portable equipment and were primarily nonstructured. They were intended for use in lieu of observations of types of teaching situations which are difficult to observe "live" within the confines of a college course. Utah's printed materials were documents resulting from pilot projects conducted by five different universities in the state. The printed materials were used in conjunction with the pilot projects, along with descriptive information and materials on the projects. The state education agency collected, reproduced, and distributed the materials.

The activities selected by each of the sub-projects in Utah were designed to improve teacher education at the participating institution by producing materials or pilot testing techniques. The involvement of the state education agency was to consult or advise and to assist in dissemination. Each institution functioned relatively autonomously in its own project. Utah's sub-projects were similar to the Washington project in that they were conducted by local institutions on a decentralized basis. However, they differed in that they were not intended to produce operational prototypes for new teacher education programs and did not begin with joint participation of an institution, a professional organization, and a local school district.

Other Leadership Activities

Florida's M-Step activities were centralized in the Department of Education, but involved regular interaction with previously established advisory groups. Under M-Step, various practices were analyzed and alternatives proposed. These proposals were then taken to the appropriate advisory groups and policy making groups. One area analyzed was teacher evaluation. This led to changes in laws and a new statewide approach to evaluation.[106] (21) Another area analyzed was inservice teacher education.

This resulted in changes in regulations and the establishment of an approved program approach in inservice education, with local districts authorized to conduct inservice education programs which fulfill requirements for extending teaching certificates.[107] A third area was a new approach to approving preservice teacher education programs which allowed greater flexibility in program design.[108]

It should be noted that, in many ways, the Washington M-Step project was similar to the Florida project. Like Florida, Washington was working toward new approaches in teacher education which would be implemented statewide. In Washington, there was less emphasis on the analysis of "hard data" and greater emphasis on wide involvement of persons who would be affected by any changes. As a result of the state leadership role in Washington, new state policies relative to teacher education were developed and reviewed. Ultimately, these policies were adopted.

Summary of M-Step Literature

Within the M-Step experience, one can find almost a full spectrum of state roles in improving teacher education. The missing portion of the spectrum is the regulatory activities which are widely treated in other literature. The state education agency activities under M-Step included the following:

1. Activating or stimulating statewide and regional committees concerned with teacher education. This includes both existing committees (such as state teacher education advisory councils) and ad hoc committees established for a given purpose.
2. Advising or consulting with institutions or agencies attempting new

approaches to teacher education.

3. Systematic analysis of policies, practices, and results. This leads to the formulation of alternative proposals.
4. Collection and dissemination of information and materials produced by other projects or agencies both inside and outside the state.
5. Production of materials (both video materials and printed materials).
6. Providing financial support for projects conducted by local school districts or higher institutions.
7. Serving as a full participant in an operational project for demonstrating a new approach to teacher education.

Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching

The joint committee on state responsibility for student teaching was appointed in October, 1964, by its seven sponsoring agencies--American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Association of School Administrators, Association for Student Teaching, Council of Chief State School Officers, Department of Classroom Teachers (NEA), National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. At its initial meeting, the committee was asked "to consider the possible scope and dimensions of state responsibility for student teaching and make appropriate recommendations."[109] The committee issued two reports, Who's in Charge Here?[110] in 1966 and A New Order in Student Teaching[111] in 1967.

The first publication calls attention to the many different persons and institutions concerned about teacher education, attempts to clarify their roles, and offers recommendations. In its assumptions, the report includes the following statement regarding state education agencies:

> State Departments of Education, in addition to certification concerns, have an important role to play in student teaching. They have recognized, at least tacitly, that many public schools have a responsibility for the education of teachers.[112]

The report's recommendations include the following which relate to state education agencies:[113]

1. That the state government officially recognize that elementary and secondary schools have a responsibility for participation in the education of teachers.
2. That state or federal funds, or both, be provided to cover some of the cost of the services of student teaching, such as administrative costs for coordination, honoraria to supervising teachers, and funds for inservice education programs related to student teaching.
3. That state agencies, in providing leadership, encouragement, and coordination of student-teaching programs, consider such functions as:
    a. Giving leadership and coordination in bringing together the appropriate groups to develop and implement student-teaching policies.
    b. Cooperating with colleges, universities, and public schools in the development of standards for student-teaching programs.
    c. Encouraging public school officials to participate in student-teaching programs.
    d. Promoting continuous improvement in curricula and teaching staffs of public schools used as student-teaching centers.
    e. Facilitating the gathering of information about existing student-teaching programs, the institutions that prepare teachers, the schools in which student teaching is done, and qualified supervising teachers available for student teaching.
    f. Cooperating with the teacher education institutions in furnishing necessary leadership, supervision, and coordination to the entire program.
    g. Considering certification or other appropriate procedures to ensure qualified supervisors of student teaching.
    h. Coordinating and participating in the evaluation of student-teaching programs.

A New Order in Student Teaching was issued after the earlier publication had been widely discussed. This report places greater importance on statewide planning and coordination. It recommends systematic plans (a new order) and repeats the recommendation for state support. State education agencies are assigned the following responsibilities:[114]

1. Facilitating statewide planning for policy and organization in student teaching and other field and clinical experiences in teacher education.
2. Setting minimum standards for the professional education of personnel involved in joint teacher education enterprises and for state approval of collaborative programs in local cooperative teaching centers.
3. Encouraging experimentation and diversity of programs beyond the minimal standards.
4. Preparing enabling legislation where required.
5. Arranging statewide financial support for the accredited cooperative programs.

The report also recommends the establishment of an "office of the coordinator of school-university programs in teacher education" in each state education agency. This office would function in a manner similar to the SEA office established under the Michigan M-Step project. An advisory council composed of representatives of the various groups concerned with professional laboratory experiences would be established to assist the office of the coordinator. Job descriptions for three different types of positions are suggested: coordinator, teacher education specialist, and teacher education consultant. Persons serving as consultants would be on temporary assignments.

To summarize from both volumes, the following points relating to state education agencies can be made. The joint committee sees need for a broad-based coordinating agency which can relate to both public schools and higher institutions. The need for relating to public schools is particularly important. Hence, the state education agency is recommended. The committee also sees need for establishing uniform practices. This implies regulation. Such regulations would possibly be administered by the state education agency, but would be developed as a result of broad participation of persons with responsibilities for professional laboratory experiences. The committee also sees need for central coordination which could be performed by the state education agency. Finally, the committee sees need for additional financial support which might be obtained through the public school finance mechanisms administered by the state education agency.

Chapter II Footnotes

[1] Lucien B. Kinney, *Certification in Education* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964).

[2] Anthony C. LaBue, "Teacher Certification in the United States: A Brief History," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 147-172.

[3] T. M. Stinnett, "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation," *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900*, ed. Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (Washington, D. C. : National Education Association, 1969).

[4] Kinney, p.56.

[5] Stinnett, *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900*, pp. 392-393.

[6] Howard E. Bosley (ed.), *Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities* (Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969), pp. 1-2.

[7] *Ibid.*, p.2.

[8] *Ibid.*, p.2.

[9] Paul Woodring, *New Directions in Teacher Education* (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957).

[10] James D. Koerner, "How Not to Teach Teachers," *The Atlantic*, CCXI (February, 1963).

[11] James D. Koerner, *The Miseducation of American Teachers* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963).

[12] James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963).

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

[14] Council of Chief State School Officers, *The State Department of Education* (Washington, D. C. : National Council of Chief State School Officers, 1952).

[15] *Ibid.*, p.28.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

[17] Council of Chief State School Officers, *Responsibilities of State Department of Education for Teacher Education* (Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1954).

[18] *Ibid.*, p.1.

[19] Council of Chief State School Officers, *State and Local Responsibilities for Education* (Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1968), pp. 34-38.

[20] New York State Education Department, *State Education Department's Policies and Practices in the Approved Program Approach to Teacher Certification* (Albany, New York: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1968).

[21] Marshall Lee Frinks, Jr., "An Analytical Study of Teacher Certification Processes as Perceived by Leadership Personnel Within the Teacher Education and Certification Sections of the Fifty State Education Agencies with Special Emphasis on the Development of the Performance-Based Movement" (Unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Massachusetts, 1971).

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 153-157.

[23] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, *Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education, Division of Teacher Personnel, 1968).

[24] T. M. Stinnett, *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States* (Washington, D. C.: The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, In Cooperation with the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1970), p.39.

[25] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, *Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education*.

[26] Wendell C. Allen, "Accreditation of Teacher Education," A newsletter sent to members of The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, May 1, 1969.

[27] Stinnett, *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States*, p. 39.

[28] Truman M. Pierce, *Federal, State and Local Government in Education* (Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964).

[29] Myron Lieberman, "Considerations Favoring National Certification of Teachers," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960).

[30] Benjamin Rosner et al., The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education, Final Report of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education, U. S. Office of Education, July 31, 1971).

[31] B. Othanel Smith, "Certification of Educational Personnel," Paper read to the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Diego, California, July 29, 1971.

[32] Kinney.

[33] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards (Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, January, 1967).

[34] Lieberman, The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2, pp. 191-201.

[35] Ibid., p. 201.

[36] Rosner et al.

[37] Smith, "Certification of Educational Personnel," Paper.

[38] Ibid., p. 11.

[39] Kinney, pp. 117-143.

[40] Wendell C. Allen, "State Government and Teacher Education -- A Different Role for the State Education Agency," The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1960).

[41] Ibid., p. 81.

[42] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards, p. 4.

[43] Ibid., p. 11.

[44] Roy A. Edelfelt, "Progress in Professional Practices Legislation," NEA Journal, LVII, No. 2 (February, 1968).

[45] National Education Association, Working Paper: Autonomy for the Teaching Profession (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969).

[46] Kinney, P. 87.

[47] H. S. Shearouse, "Planned Programs of Teacher Education Versus Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960).

[48] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] John R. Mayor, *Accreditation in Teacher Education, Its Influence on Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: The National Commission on Accreditation, 1965) pp. 114-130.

[51] Daryl Pendergraft, "The Process Versus the Product Issue in the Accreditation of Teacher Education," *Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education*, ed. Karl Massanari (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967).

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[53] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *Recommended Standards for Teacher Education* (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, March, 1970).

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

[56] Smith, "Certification of Educational Personnel," Paper, p. 10.

[57] H. Del Schalock, "The Focus: Knowledge, Teaching Behavior, or the Products?" *Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel*, ed. Joel L. Burdin and Margaret T. Reagan (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and The Association of Teacher Educators, 1971).

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 34-37.

[59] Stinnett, *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States*, pp. 34-35.

[60] Earl E. Mosier, "Proficiency Examination - A Wise or Unwise Policy?" *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960).

[61] Donald M. Medley, *Specifications for a New Teacher Examination: A First Approximation* (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, September, 1970).

[62] Schalock, *Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel*.

[63] Smith, "Certification of Educational Personnel," Paper.

[64] K. Fred Daniel, "Shaping the Future of Florida Education," *Florida Schools*, XXXIII, No. 5 (May-June, 1971).

[65] Theodore E. Andrews, *New Directions in Certification*, Report of a Study Sponsored by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; the State Board of Education in the State of Washington; and Improving State Leadership in Education Project (Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education Project, September, 1970).

[66] Earl W. Armstrong, "A Basis for Reciprocity in Teacher Certification," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960).

[67] Stinnett, A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, p. 36.

[68] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education.

[69] Stinnett, A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, p. 39.

[70] Interstate Certification Project, Taking Your Talents Across State Lines (Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, undated).

[71] Stinnett, A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, p. 36.

[72] James B. Conant, "The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State-Approved Program Approach," AACTE: A Decade of Thought on Teacher Education: The Charles W. Hunt Lectures (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969).

[73] New York State Education Department, The Five-College Project, A report of the proceedings of the Five-College Project Conference (Albany, New York: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1968).

[74] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[75] Ibid., p. 23.

[76] Alvin P.Lierheimer, "Give Up the Ship: A New Basis for State Certification," The English Record, XX, No. 1 (October, 1969), p. 70.

[77] Alvin P. Lierheimer, "Cast Off the Bowline!" Today's Education, CVIII, No. 3 (March, 1969).

[78] Karl Massanari, "AACTE Explores Performance-Based Teacher Education," Bulletin, XXIV, No. 1 (March, 1971), p. 3.

[79] Rosner et al.

[80] Smith, "Certification of Educational Personnel," Paper.

[81] A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States, pp. 23-24.

[82] Rosner et al., p. 34.

[83] Lierheimer, *The English Record*, XX, No. 1.

[84] State of Florida Department of Education, *Florida's Strategy for Stimulating Constructive Change and Self-Renewal in Education* (Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, August, 1971).

[85] Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (eds.), *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education* (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967).

[86] Warren G. Hill, "The Dynamic Duo," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967), pp. 10-11.

[87] John R. Mayor, "Creative and Constructive Adaptation," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967), pp. 35-37.

[88] Roe L. Johns, "State Organization and Responsibility for Education," *Designing Education for the Future: An Eight State Project*, ed. Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: The Citation Press, 1967).

[89] J. Allan Ross, "Improvement of Teacher Education in the State of Washington," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967).

[90] James C. Stone, "The Future of Teacher Education: Implications for a State Department of Education," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967).

[91] Hill, *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, pp. 3-4.

[92] J. R. Rackley and Norman A. Miller, "Broad Policy Concerns and Direction for a State Department of Education in Teacher Education," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967), p. 15.

[93] Mayor, "Creative and Constructive Adaptation," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*.

[94] Allen, "State Government and Teacher Education -- A Different Role for the State Education Agency," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education*, p. 81.

[95] Roy A. Edelfelt, Innovative Programs in Student Teaching, A Report of a conference in Baltimore, Maryland (Baltimore, Maryland: State Department of Public Instruction, 1969).

[96] Joel L. Burdin and Margaret T. Reagan (eds.), Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, 1971).

[97] Howard E. Bosley (ed.), Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. I: An Experiment in Change (Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969).

[98] Bosley (ed.), Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities.

[99] B. Othanel Smith et al., Teachers for the Real World (Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969).

[100] Saul B. Cohen and Mitchell P. Lichtenberg, "Final Report: Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes," Worcester, Massachusetts: Training Complex Project Administrative Center, Clark University, July 1, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

[101] Rosner et al.

[102] Earl W. Armstrong and Howard E. Bosley, "The State Education Agency in Teacher Education," Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities (Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969).

[103] K. Fred Daniel, "Consortiums," Unpublished paper prepared at the request of the Chairman of Task Force '72. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, June 8, 1971.

[104] Herbert Hite, "POINT -- An Innovation in Teacher Education and State Leadership," The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education, ed. Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen (Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967).

[105] Bosley (ed.), Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. I: An Experiment in Change, p. 32.

[106] K. Fred Daniel, The Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching: A Conceptualization of a Plan For Use In State Educational Leadership (Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, May, 1969).

[107] Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, State of Florida Department of Education, Criteria For Designing, Developing and Approving A District Master Plan for Inservice Teacher Education (Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, April, 1970), pp. 34-34.

[108] Bosley (ed.), Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities, pp. 34-35.

[109] Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching, Who's in Charge Here?: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching (Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1966), p. 3.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching, A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching (Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1967).

[112] Joint Committee on State Responsiblity for Student Teaching, Who's in Charge Here? p. 9.

[113] Ibid., pp. 12-15.

[114] Joint Committee on State Responsiblity for Student Teaching, A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsiblities for Student Teaching, p. 13.

CHAPTER III. THREE CASE STUDIES

Eleven states--California, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Utah, and Washington--participated in the 1970 Miami Training Session on Performance-Based Teacher Certification. Twenty-seven additional states applied. All applicants indicated a degree of commitment toward changing teacher education programs within their boundaries. Each of those states would represent a useful case for persons interested in studying the role of state education agencies in teacher education. Unfortunately, published accounts of SEA teacher education activities in most states are not readily available. The writers of this report found information on Florida, New York, and Washington to be most accessible. Thus, the present Chapter comprises a brief analysis of SEA teacher education activities in those states.

The literature reviewed in this Chapter consists of reports or documents issued by the three state education agencies, along with writings by Fred Daniel and Cecil Golden of Florida, Theodore Andrews and Alvin Lierheimer of New York, and Wendell Allen, William H. Drummond, and Lillian Cady of Washington. These persons are all current or former officials in teacher education and certification in their respective state education agencies.

It should be noted that this is not the first attempt to compare teacher education leadership activities in Florida, New York, and Washington. Andrews has written a paper, "Competency-Based Certification,"[1] in which he discusses current activities in Florida, New York, and Washington as they relate to competency-based teacher certification. The Andrews paper was prepared in conjunction with the National Conference on Performance-Based Teacher Education held in Houston in 1971.

The Andrews Paper

Andrews characterized states attempting to implement competency-based certification as "ships, halfway across chartered waters, land yet to be sighted." He adds that "their wakes. . .provide some direction to those who may want to follow." He finds the experience of these states to be the only "advice" available.[2] His paper was written to make this advice accessible.

Andrews cites three continually reappearing answers to the question, "Why should a state establish a competency-based certification policy?"[3]

1. To improve teacher education by assuring that persons given certificates are actually competent.
2. To improve learning opportunities for children.
3. To provide a means for making significant changes in all aspects of education.

Andrews sees the first two reasons as equally pervasive in Florida, New York, and Washington. He feels that the third reason is more applicable to Washington and New York which are attempting to shift the power base for education through teacher education policies.

Andrews discusses the way in which the three states are approaching performance criteria. New York and Washington are deliberately avoiding the establishment of performance criteria from the state level. Florida is developing a catalog of teaching competencies from which teacher education programs can draw. This catalog is considered a resource and is developed to aid teacher education personnel. Performance criteria which may be adopted are not restricted to those included in the catalog.

The necessity for academic degrees is another issue treated by Andrews. The State of New York is continuing to require a baccalaureate. degree for teacher certification in most fields. Washington may not. Allen asserts "that any degree requirement is philosophically inconsistent with the belief that a person's demonstrated competency should be the criteria for certification."[4] Consistent with this position, Washington's new standards do not require a specific amount of academic study to qualify for the initial teaching certification, but suggest that baccalaureate level knowledge might be expected. Florida currently requires a baccalaureate degree in most fields and, thus far, has not proposed to change this requirement.

State Plans

The plans for implementing performance-based teacher education vary among the three states. For Florida, Andrews, cites the target which was established by the Board of Governors for the Florida Educational Research and Development Program:

> "By the end of 1974, competencies expected of teaching personnel in elementary and secondary schools will be clearly identified. Evidence will be available showing relationships between teacher competencies and pupil learning. Teacher training techniques will be available for use in preservice and inservice teacher education programs which are aimed at the specified competencies. Evidence will be available to state policymakers which shows the extent to which teacher effects on pupil learning support various credentialing requirements."[5]

Andrews notes that the state education agency in Florida is concentrating on providing technical support including (a) development of a catalog of teaching competencies (discussed earlier), (b) collecting, evaluating, and disseminating available teacher training materials, and (c) conducting orientation sessions at institutions and school districts throughout the state. Thus, the Florida SEA is emphasizing technical support and training activities.

Washington's plans revolve around the development, adoption, and implementation of new standards for preparation of school professional personnel leading to certification.[6] The development of these standards was a four-year program headed by the three-member teacher education staff in the Washington state education agency. The standards provide that teacher education programs shall be planned by consortiums of universities, professional associations, and school organizations, with each participant having equal voice.

The Washington standards also stipulate that a teacher preparation program should address competencies in subject matter specialties, pedagogy, and personal characteristics. The standards depict the professional educator as a decision maker.

The standards include four essential ideas:[7]

1. Professional preparation should continue throughout the career of the practitioner.
2. School organizations and professional associations, as well as colleges and universities, should be recognized as preparation agencies.

3. Discussions about preparation should be based upon performance; performance in relation to stated objectives in the role of the practitioner.
4. Preparation and career development programs should be individualized.

In many ways, New York is following the approach of Washington. It has developed "process standards." These standards include four major elements:

1. The program must be planned, developed, monitored, and evaluated by cooperating agencies acting as a policy board. The policy board shall include public school representative, representatives from institutions of higher learning, teachers, and teacher education students.
2. The program developers must address the following questions: (a) What are the student objectives and the priorities of the schools involved? (b) What competencies should a teacher have to serve in those schools?
3. The program developers must specify procedures for measuring the mastery of competencies and the evidence which will be accepted.
4. A management system must be established to provide continuous data for operating and evaluating the program.

Andrews notes that all three states are using a form of "process standards." Such standards specify the processes which will be followed in developing and implementing programs. They do not specify the competencies to be mastered by trainees, the training procedures to be followed, or the conditions under which the training will take place. Thus, the evaluation criteria must provide an indication of the extent to which the processes in the standards were followed. He also points out that by 1974, Florida anticipates having product criteria which can be used for program evaluation. In the meantime, the process criteria must suffice.

Summary

Washington has made a major effort to get involvement from all affected persons in the development of a new set of standards for teacher education program approval. This was a four-year process. The standards have been adopted and pilot projects to implement the standards are underway.

Andrews does not discuss the process by which the New York "process standards" were developed. Undoubtedly, it did not incorporate the extensive grass roots involvement that characterized the Washington experience. Instead, the emphasis in New York is on testing the feasibility of the proposed standards in actual programs.

Florida is placing major emphasis on developing the technology and training the personnel within the state to implement new types of teacher education programs. Regulations or standards have not been changed.

All three states have endorsed a competency-based or performance-based approach to teacher education. They are all relying on local institutions to develop and implement programs, rather than specifying competencies from the state level. Washington and New York consider it vital to have institutional personnel, school district personnel, and professional organization personnel represented in any group responsible for developing a teacher education program. New York adds students to this list.

Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

In this section, as well as in the section on "the SEA leadership role in teacher education," additional literature is reviewed, supplementing the Andrews analysis of the SEA role in teacher education in the three states.

Appropriate Jurisdiction for Certification

The literature reviewed in Chapter II suggests six different positions regarding the appropriate jurisdiction for teacher certification and teacher education program approval. They are as follows:

1. Complete autonomy on the part of each state in issuing teaching certificates.
2. Each state has full authority in determining whether or not candidates are eligible to receive certificates, but the types and classes of certificates available are determined by a national authority.
3. The certificates issued by each state are restricted to those representing minimum standards, while an extralegal agency issues certificates which recognize higher levels of competence.
4. The responsibility for determining teacher competence rests with an external agency (presumably the organized teaching profession or local education agencies); the state issues certificates to persons certified as competent by the external agency.
5. The state education agency is given no authority for issuing certificates or approving teacher education programs.

In the administration of certification in all three states, there is a discrepancy between the long-range policy advocated and regulations currently being implemented. Each state education agency is now operating under alernative one, complete autonomy at the state level. Allen (Washington) has already been identified with position four through his advocacy for transferring detailed regulatory activities to other agencies within each state, presumably local school districts.[8] Washington has already made some progress in this direction with the implementation of the approved program approach to teacher education. The standards for teacher education program approval in Washington which have been in effect for ten years leave great discretion to universities which prepare teachers. Thus, the determination of standards for individual candidates and the record keeping regarding the achievement of those standards is handled by personnel associated with individual institutions.

Lierheimer (New York) advocates the development of an extralegal licensing structure under the auspices of the professional association. At the same time, he sees credential requirements established by local school districts. He suggests "every task in the schools may need to be performed by someone with an employment credential, but only specialized tasks will fall to a licensed professional."[9] However, he advocates that the state continue to be the processor and the repository of teacher certification records.[10]

The Florida literature does not clearly indicate that a change in the jurisdiction of teacher certification is anticipated. However, Daniel's description of the administrative procedures for teacher certification which will be called for under performance-based teacher certification programs suggests that most detailed analysis will be done by local program personnel.

Standards for Teacher Certification and Teacher Education Program Approval

Two dimensions of standards were discussed in Chapter II--the input-process-output dimension and the level of specificity. All three states are moving toward output standards. This, in fact, was the prime consideration in Andrews' paper[11] which was discussed earlier. Output standards carry with them less specificity of input and process standards and greater specificity of output standards. Notably, there are variations between the three states.

Florida

A dual approach to teacher certification is followed in Florida. That is, both the course-credit approach and approved program approach are used. The course-credit approach is used for candidates who have not completed a program approved by either the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education or the Florida Commissioner of Education. The course-credit requirements specify course areas. For example, professional education course requirements (semester hours) for secondary teachers are: secondary curriculum and materials, 6; psychological foundations, 3; sociological foundations, 3; methods, 2; student teaching, 6.[12] Nevertheless, candidates holding baccalaureate degrees but having specific course deficiencies may obtain certificates allowing them to teach for a given period of time while academic work to remove deficiencies is being completed.

The course-credit certification regulations currently in effect were adopted in 1964. This change followed a complete rewriting of the regulations to clarify their content, make standards less prescriptive, provide consistency between the various sections, and to facilitate state level administration of certification. The Teacher Education Program Approval Standards now in effect in Florida were adopted in substantially their present form in 1964. These follow the general provisions of the Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education issued by the National Association of

State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.[13] (The Proposed Standards were discussed in Chapter II.)

The procedures for administering the program approval standards were changed in 1967. Prior to that time, teacher education program approval was primarily designed to assure the quality of the institutional resources which supported the courses specified in the teacher certification regulations. No provisions were made for deviation from the course prescriptions set forth by the state.

When the state education agency began seeking new approaches to teacher education and certification, the possibility of changing standards for certification and teacher education program approval was considered. This option was not taken, however, since no set of acceptable standards appeared on the horizon. (To be acceptable a set of standards should be demonstrably better and capable of being uniformally implemented.) Instead, ways were sought to implement new approaches under the present program approval standards. Thereafter, institutions and local school districts have been encouraged to develop alternative teacher education practices.

To guide new teacher education efforts, three types of action have been taken. The first, by the State Teacher Education Advisory Council, was to begin developing guidelines for teacher education programs. The Council is composed of representatives from teacher preparation institutions, public schools (administrators, supervisors, and teachers), the organized teaching profession, the state education agency, and the lay public. The guidelines were intended to replace prescriptive standards for designing and evaluating teacher education programs. Guidelines were expected to meet the following criteria:[14]

1. They must cite the types of behaviors in children which are expected to be fostered through the services of the personnel participating in the teacher education program.
2. They must describe the competencies needed by teachers in order to provide the desired services.
3. They must describe the teacher education experiences needed to develop the desired competencies.
4. They must present criteria for selecting candidates for the teacher education program.
5. They must include a plan for following up persons who have completed the program to determine their effectiveness on the job.
6. They must be applicable to both preservice and inservice teacher education programs.

A second action taken to promote improved teacher education programs, while encouraging alternative practices, was to advocate performance-based curricula for teacher education. Performance-based teacher education was discussed in Chapter II. It was advocated by the Florida Department of Education to promote communication between local school personnel and institutional personnel regarding the objectives and outcomes of teacher education programs. Performance-based teacher education was not conceived in Florida as a means of guaranteeing improved teacher education programs. The SEA merely looked upon a movement toward performance-based teacher education as a way of helping to tell which competencies graduates of a given program are expected to master. Then, local school districts are in a better position to judge whether or not those program graduates have mastered the competencies needed in their schools.

It is, of course, an expectation of the Florida Department of Education that performance-based teacher education will lead to improved programs. The agency believes that the employment practice of local school boards is the most powerful force available for influencing preservice teacher education programs offered by colleges and universities.[15] Performance-based teacher education should help local officials to discriminate between candidates for employment.

In 1970, the SEA began seeking a set of new program approval standards which will encourage institutions to develop alternative approaches to teacher education. The present standards, while allowing this, do not actually encourage alternatives. The agency requested that the State Teacher Education Advisory Council recommend a new set of standards. The Council appointed a task force which produced a first draft of a set of new standards in the fall of 1970. These were reviewed by the total Council and recommendations for changes were proposed. The standards were revised and presented to the Council at its spring meeting in 1971.[16] The Proposed Standards were accepted for field-testing or tryout by the Council.

The new standards, which are not yet official, are similar to the "process standards" which have been adopted by New York and Washington. They are different in that they do not require any specific groups to be involved in determining which competencies shall be included in a teacher education program or in determining the manner in which those competencies will be assessed. Instead, the standards require that all relevant sources of information be used including published research, guidelines prepared by various groups (including the Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council), advice from practitioners and from persons conducting similar training programs in other institutions. In contrast to the current standards, the proposed new standards ask teacher education agencies to establish their own standards from program resources and activities. These standards must, of course, be based on the performance criteria which each teacher education agency establishes.

A key to the effectiveness of programs developed under the new standards will be the management practices employed by the teacher education agencies. The proposed new standards require that (a) decision making responsibility be clearly delineated, (b) admission criteria be clearly defined, (c) procedures for determining when performance criteria have been met are specific, (d) procedures for dealing with individuals who do not meet performance criteria are specific, (e) procedures for designating persons who have completed the program are specific, and (f) procedures for following up persons who have completed the program are specific. Minimum standards for follow-up procedures are specified.

To summarize, Florida deals with teacher certification and program approval with a set of fairly traditional certification standards and program approval standards. A dual approach to certification is followed, using the course-credit approach with institutions which have not received formal approval. The procedures for administering the program approval regulations have been modified so that alternative teacher preparation practices are possible. Teacher education program guidelines are being prepared to aid institutions in program development and evaluation. Also, a new set of program approval standards are under development. These standards are designed to encourage, rather than merely to permit, the development and implementation of performance-based teacher education programs.

New York

The discussion on "specificity of standards" in Chapter II included references to activities in New York. When Conant issued his recommendations on teacher education, New York seized upon the opportunity to test the Conant ideas. This was done through the Five College Project.[17] The project results indicate that granting flexibility in teacher preparation standards does not necessarily detract from the quality of teacher preparation. Lierheimer, in a number of articles over the past few years has advocated flexible certification standards.

Presently, New York issues teaching certificates in secondary teaching fields to baccalaureate degree holders with a major of 36 hours, 12 hours in education courses, and a supervised teaching experience. Permanent certification is attained upon completion of an additional specified 30 credit hours at the post-baccalaureate level. These certification standards were adopted in 1968. Prior to that time, New York's teacher certification standards were highly detailed and specific. The decision to change grew out of skepticism on the part of SEA personnel regarding the value of the detailed requirements. This skepticism was supported by the results of the Five College Study.

The State Education Department in New York has established procedures for approval of teacher education programs. This program approval is closely connected with teacher certification. Onsite program reviews are conducted by the state education agency to assure that program graduates meet certification standards. When a program is registered as having been approved, graduates of that program may obtain teaching certificates without a detailed transcript analysis by the certification section of the state education agency. This is similar to the dual approach to teacher certification which is employed in Florida.

The change in New York certification standards in 1968 naturally carried with it a change in program approval standards. This is true because the program approval standards in New York are essentially the certification standards. Thus, the removal of detailed requirements from certification standards also was a removal of detailed requirements from program approval standards.

In 1971, New York adopted a new set of "process standards" for teacher education program approval. These were discussed in the review of the Andrews paper above. These standards are intended to promote the implementation of performance-based or competency-based teacher education. The standards are now being tested in a series of trial projects. As described earlier, the standards specify the processes which should be followed in developing and implementing teacher education programs. They do not specify the content.

In summary, during the past few years, New York has moved from highly specific and detailed certification standards to more flexible standards. Program approval practices have changed along with the change in standards. In addition, a new set of "process standards" for program approval has been developed and is being tested. These standards are intended to promote performance-based or competency-based teacher certification.

Washington

For many years, teacher certification in Washington has been characterized by flexible standards. Graduates of state institutions are issued provisional certificates on the basis of completion of a four year preservice program leading to the baccalaureate degree. Out-of-state candidates are granted certificates if they are eligible for a comparable certificate in other states. Washington places major emphasis on advanced academic preparation. All teachers are expected to complete a fifth year of preparation within six years of receipt of their initial teaching certificate. Fifth year programs are planned in light of the teacher's first year of experience. It is recommended that only 15 of the 45 required quarter hours be completed prior to or doing the first year in teaching experience.

The standards for teacher education program approval which have been used in Washington since 1961 are also characterized by flexibility. The following excerpt from the forward to those standards describes their major features.[18]

1. State standards for teacher education programs are in the form of guidelines rather than specific or detailed requirements. The guidelines provide for programs designed for particular teaching responsibilities and tailor-made programs for individuals based on analysis of the competencies needed.
2. Authorization is provided for a thorough program of State evaluation of teacher education programs.
3. Institutions are charged with responsibility for selection, retention, and recommendation of teacher candidates.
4. School districts retain the primary responsibility for sound utilization of teacher personnel. However, they are directed to assign beginning teachers in accordance with the recommendations of institutions. Provision is made for close State surveillance and approval of beginning teacher assignments.
5. The subject matter preparation of all teachers will be strengthened. Elementary teachers will have a major subject matter area of study. Secondary teachers' subject matter major areas will be strengthened.
6. Provision is made for joint teacher education program planning by academic and professional education faculties.
7. The standards call for close college and school district cooperation in program planning and implementation. This should lead to strengthening of teacher preparation in teaching theory and practice as well as in subject matter.
8. Fifth college year programs must be approved by colleges and must include both academic and professional studies. Colleges are encouraged to include fifth-year college planning as part of a total program plan.

Each teacher education institution in Washington prepares an annual report. This report, along with other information is reviewed by a liaison committee which makes annual visits to each institution. These visits fulfill an advisory or inservice function, rather than an inspection function.

As discussed earlier, Washington has just completed a four-year effort to develop a new set of "Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification."[19,20,21] These standards were recently adopted by the State Board of Education. These standards propose a new set of procedures for the development and approval of teacher education programs; they also propose a new set of certificates--a preparatory certificate (for teachers in training), an initial certificate (for beginning teachers), a continuing certificate, and a consultant certificate.[22] These certificates can be issued for teachers, for administrators, and for educational staff associates (counselors, etc.). The standards are similar to New York's new "process standards" in that they specify the processes of program development, rather than the content. (The Washington standards had a great deal of influence on the New York standards as the latter were being developed.)

The conditions which a program must meet in order to be approved by the State Board of Education are set forth in the standards:[23]

1. Is based upon an analysis and a description of the performance expectations for the particular professional role for which the program is designed. Because roles change as new knowledge is created, analyses and descriptions of performance need to be revised periodically.
2. Provides for inter-institutional collaboration; that is, the program is conceived and developed by three types of agencies --colleges, school organizations, and professional associations.
3. Corresponds with and is based upon the current and projected personnel needs of the state.
4. Is individualized; that is, individual needs are cared for and the individual talents of persons are nurtured; learning tasks are chosen or assigned as a consequence of an individual's readiness to perform.
5. Provides frequent and periodic feedback to participants re their performance.
6. Is offered by agencies which have the human and material resources required to field the proposed program.
7. Is offered by agencies which provide frequent and periodic performance feedback to their own faculties.
8. Is offered by agencies which have worked out an agreed upon system for recommending persons for changes in certification.

9. Is offered by agencies which have on file with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction a description of the program based on these standards and the items listed in "Preparation", above.

In summary, the State of Washington has adopted flexible standards for both teacher certification and teacher education program approval. These standards have been in effect for many years. Recently, the state has developed a new set of standards aimed at implementing performance-based teacher education programs. An important aspect of the standards is the stipulation for joint participation by school districts, universities, and professional organizations in program development and implementation.

Regulation of Inservice Education

In Washington and New York, the regulation of inservice education is closely tied with the requirement for a fifth year of preparation. Thus, the regulation of inservice teacher education cannot be separated from the regulation of preservice teacher education. A suggested future direction for inservice education has been suggested by Lierhiemer of New York. This recommendation, which was discussed earlier, is that continuing certification be based on performance criteria applied locally.[24] Teacher trainers in local schools would be responsible for evaluating teacher performance, instituting training procedures, and making recommendations for certification.

Washington's future directions for regulating inservice education will no doubt be tied in with the "continuing" certificate. (As an aside, it should be noted that regulation may not be an appropriate term to apply to SEA teacher education activities in Washington. In that state, the SEA teacher education personnel avoid regulating, preferring to guide and counsel.) Programs developed for continuing certificates in Washington will be designed in a manner identical with those for initial certificates, with representatives of all constituent agencies involved.

In Florida, the recent impetus in regulating inservice education has not been dependent upon credit-course work. Inservice education is legally the responsibility of local school boards. Each board is expected to develop a comprehensive program of staff development. These programs may be credit or non-credit, conducted by a school district independently, by school districts jointly with a higher institution, by higher institutions, or by other appropriate agencies.

Local school districts may apply for approval of their inservice education programs. When such approval is granted, persons participating successfully in local programs may have their teaching certificates extended. Program approval is administered by the state education agency in a manner similar to that followed in approving teacher education programs operated by colleges and universities. To date, 65 of the 67 school districts in Florida have approved inservice education programs.

In order to be approved, a local school district offering an inservice education program must meet the following requirements:

1. Complete a self-study.
2. Develop a master plan for inservice education encompassing a five year period.
3. For each component of the master plan, provide a statement of

objectives, a summary statement of procedures, and identify techniques to be used in evaluating the degree to which the objectives have been achieved.

4. The master plan for inservice education should make provisions for three types of inservice education activities: indepth study in basic teaching skills (applicable to all types and levels of teaching), indepth study in skills and knowledge in specific subject areas, and exploratory activities. The first two types of components require specific objectives and assessment techniques (i.e., they are expected to be performance-based). Exploratory activities may be opened ended.
5. A record keeping and management system must be developed.[25]

To summarize, New York and Washington treat the regulation of inservice education as part of the regulation of preservice education. As the states move toward performance-based programs, it is anticipated that there will be a much closer relationship between job assignments and inservice training. Washington has already made considerable progress in this direction. In Florida, a different strategy is being used to link job assignments with inservice education. The state has developed a program approval approach which is applied to inservice education programs conducted by local school districts.

Leadership Activities

The description of the M-Step project included seven types of teacher education leadership activities which might be carried out by state education agencies. They are as follows:

1. Activating or stimulating statewide and regional committees concerned with teacher education.
2. Systematic analysis of policies, practices, and results.
3. Collection and dissemination of information and materials produced by other projects or agencies.
4. Production of materials.
5. Providing financial support for projects conducted by local school districts or higher institutions.
6. Advising or consulting with institutions or agencies attempting new approaches to teacher education.
7. Serving as a full participant in an operational project for demonstrating a new approach to teacher education.

Most of these activities are now being employed by state education agencies in Florida, New York, and Washington. It should be recognized that many of the activities in these states which were discussed in the preceding section relating to regulations are actually leadership activities. This would include developing new standards and guidelines. The remainder of this Chapter describes additional leadership activities being carried out in those states.

Florida

Florida's leadership activities in teacher education are an integral part of the state's total strategy for effecting constructive educational change.[26] This strategy has the following three elements: (a) clarifying goals and objectives for all educational programs, (b) analyzing and evaluating all educational programs, and (c) generating alternatives to encourage self-renewal.

The leadership activities described in the Florida section of the M-Step survey in Chapter II are still continuing. In addition, a major developmental effort in teacher education is underway as part of the State's Educational Research and Development Program. The teacher education portion of this R & D effort is intended to provide each institution or agency conducting teacher education programs with the knowledge, skills, and materials which will be required to implement a performance-based approach to teacher education. The state education agency is attempting to carry out on a broad scale those activities which would be required of each individual institution or agency as it develops new teacher education techniques. The educational research and development effort in teacher education has the following four components:[27]

1. Compile a catalog of teaching competencies. This catalog will serve as a non-prescriptive reference document for organizing training materials, for analyzing teacher training programs, and for identifying competencies for validation through research projects. The catalog will include, as nearly as practicable, all objectives which might be sought in any teacher preparation program. No single program will be expected to include all objectives in the catalog.
2. Conduct research (or secure research results) on the relationship between specified teaching competencies and pupil achievement. The basic impetus for this research program was the recommendation which was made by the Florida Board of Governors for Educational Research and development: 'The Department of

Education should seriously consider a policy which would provide that by 1974, teacher certification requirements would be based only on research evidence showing the relationship between specified teacher characteristics or behaviors and pupil achievement."[28]

3. Assemble (or produce) training materials for implementing performance-based teacher education. In order for the training of educational personnel to improve significantly, the Florida SEA believes it will be necessary to obtain or develop carefully designed and validated training materials. These would include materials for instruction in the theoretical aspects of teaching and supervision (often called protocol materials) and materials for training and specific teaching, planning, or supervisory skills. Materials should be designed to improve the efficiency of training and to reduce training costs where practical. A major effort is being made to identify materials which are already available. Also, several teacher training modules have been developed through various federally supported projects in Florida. The state has established centers for collecting and disseminating these materials.
4. Establish a statewide program for training teacher trainers. Such a program is being initiated in September, 1971, with orientation sessions for school district personnel and university personnel throughout the state. The orientation sessions will deal with concepts related to performance-based teacher education. These will be followed by training sessions on developing teacher

training modules, analyzing and designing teacher education programs using a catalog of competencies, reviewing and evaluating available teacher training materials, and using protocol materials for teacher education.

In sum, Florida's new state leadership efforts in teacher education are aimed at developing techniques and materials for implementing performance-based teacher education, making these materials available to potential users, and providing training in the skills and knowledge required to carry out performance-based teacher education.

New York

A major element of New York's leadership strategy in teacher education has been the teacher education program approval activities discussed earlier. An equally important element is the sponsorship of various inservice education courses, workshops, and other activities. Stated differently, a major element of New York's leadership strategy in teacher education resides in the use of discretionary funds to sponsor promising teacher education activities. For several years, state inservice funds have been available. These have been supplemented with state and federal funds for special purposes such as drug education and vocational education.

One example of a project funded from discretionary monies was the National Symposium on Evaluation-Education which was held at Buffalo in 1968. This symposium was jointly sponsored by the State Education Department and the State University College in Buffalo. This conference can be viewed as the kickoff of New York's movement toward performance-based teacher education. The following statement from the Preface of the Symposium Report depicts the spirit of the endeavor.

> At this Symposium, researchers, public school administrators, college professors, and State Education Department personnel made a challenge to the future. They were brought together to decide if enough is known about performance evaluation for the State of New York to encourage colleges and school systems to prepare teachers on the basis of objective analysis of teaching performance. The answers were clear--we need to know more, but we can't wait; we know enough to begin.[29]

Most of the discretionary funds are administered by the Bureau of Inservice Education in the Division of Teacher Education and Certification. This is a large Bureau with approximately sixteen professional personnel. Staff members in this Bureau review proposals for inservice education activities and also observe at least a portion of the operations of each project supported.

The Bureau supports both collegiate and non-collegiate programs. In 1969-70, collegiate programs were offered under academic sub-areas, of health programs, occupational education, and driver safety education. The non-collegiate programs included regional programs and locally originated inservice projects. Non-collegiate programs are offered on a matching basis, with local school districts providing a portion of the support. They are designed to contain sufficient flexibility to meet local needs. For regional programs, the state education agency has trained instructors to teach local inservice courses in mathematics, science, and social studies, as well as instructors for helping teachers to work with disadvantaged children.

As mentioned earlier, New York is establishing pilot programs to test the new "process standards" for teacher education program approval. This is being supported through federal funds allocated to the state.

Thus, a major element of New York's leadership strategy in teacher education is to use discretionary funds to support teacher education activities--primarily inservice--which are consistent with state priorities. Many of these activities are college based. However, they also include locally initiated inservice activities.

Washington

The state education agency in Washington carries out two major types of leadership activities in teacher education, in addition to those already discussed. These are (a) securing federal or foundation funds to support pilot activities, most of which are conducted by institutions or local agencies, and (b) stimulating involvement through conferences, meetings, committees, and informal discussions. There is a series of recent projects for which the state education agency has obtained support. These began with the project for orientation and induction of new teachers (POINT).[30] This project supported nine sub-projects for demonstrating cooperative approaches to teacher education involving schools, colleges, and professional associations. As indicated by its title, POINT was aimed at helping beginning teachers.

A second project for which the state education agnecy received funding was the Seattle Conference on the role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education. This was discussed in Chapter II. This was followed by the Multi-State Teacher Education Project (M-Step) which was also discussed in Chapter II. The SEA has also obtained federal funds for conducting pilot projects for implementing the new standards, for training leadership personnel (TTT), and for training state education agency personnel in human relations and change-agent techniques.

The teacher education leadership personnel in the Washington SEA see themselves as change agents.[31] In this context, they attempt to bring people together. They have worked intensively at this task over the past four years as their new standards were being developed. Drummond sees the SEA as a neutral agency exceptionally well qualified for performing this function:

> The development of a context for change and the focusing of diverse professional energies onto immediate tasks and goals require that people be together. The SEA can play a uniquely useful role in this because the SEA usually is viewed as a neutral. If a particular college or university convenes a meeting or conference, it is viewed by the experienced attenders as an exercise in self interest. Similarly, if a school system or a professional association brings a group together the motives are often suspect by out-group members. The SEA, on the other hand, representing all facets of the common school system usually can bring people together physically in a non-threatening atmosphere and, if SEA personnel are skilled, can keep discussions focused and profitable. The SEA can devise ways for dialogue between academic and professional faculties, between school organization and university faculties, between academic and vocational teachers, between black and white citizens, between professional associations and unions, between teachers and administrators, etc. Because creative thoughts are sparked by the clash of differing ideas in a permissive atmosphere, the SEA, by bringing together educational forces and arranging meaningful confrontations, can help promote higher level and more creative solutions to mutual problems.[32]

Conclusion

This Chapter has described the state education agencies in three different states, each moving out to bring about changes in teacher education. The SEA in New York is a large agency with a large staff in teacher education. It has been well financed and has been able to use these funds to bring about changes in areas which it deems to be priorities. It has recently established performance-based teacher education as a priority. It has made regulations more flexible and has initiated pilot projects to test the utility of new "process standards" for teacher education program approval.

Florida is a medium size state education agency. It makes greater use of regulations as a leadership device, as witnessed by the state in-service education program. However, it does not adopt new regulations unless capabilities for implementing those regulations are extant in the state. Thus, teacher certification regulations have not been changed and efforts to change teacher education program approval regulations are just beginning. The state is putting its major efforts on developing the techniques and expertise needed to implement new approaches to teacher education and certification.

Washington is a less populous state with a smaller state education agency staff in teacher education and certification. The personnel on that staff avoid the regulatory role as much as possible. Standards are extremely flexible. The emphasis is on stimulating participation and involvement of all constituent groups. At the same time, the agency makes every effort to secure financial support which will assist the constituent groups in their efforts.

Chapter III Footnotes

[1] Theodore E. Andrews, "Competency-Based Certification," Prepublication draft, 1971, manuscript.

[2] Ibid., p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] Ibid., p. 12.

[5] K. Fred Daniel, "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: Florida's Projected Program," An unpublished paper prepared as a discussion document for use by staff members in the Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, May 5, 1971. (Mimeographed), p. 8.

[6] State of Washington, Statement of Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Fourth Draft (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, April, 1968).

[7] Andrews, "Competency-Based Certification," Manuscript, p. ii.

[8] Allen, The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education, p. 81.

[9] Alvin P. Lierheimer, "Changing the Palace Guard," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, No. 1 (September, 1970), p. 24.

[10] Lierheimer, The English Record, XX, No. 1, p. 69.

[11] Andrews, "Competency-Based Certification," Manuscript.

[12] Florida State Board of Education, Florida State Board of Education: Regulations (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State Board of Education, September, 1970).

[13] National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

[14] K. Fred Daniel, "Whither Teacher Education?" Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities (Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969), pp. 12-13.

[15] William Cecil Golden, "The Role of the State Department of Education in Managing Teacher Education and Certification," Paper read to the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Diego, California, July 29, 1971, p. 16.

[16] Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council, "Revision of Chapter V, Regulations of the State Board of Education," New Regulations proposed by the Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council, March, 1971.

[17] New York State Education Department, The Five College Project.

[18] State of Washington, Standards for Teacher Education (Olympia, Washington: Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1962), p. 3.

[19] State of Washington, Guidelines for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Second Draft (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, April 20, 1967).

[20] State of Washington, Guidelines for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification, Third Draft (Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, September, 1967).

[21] State of Washington, Standards for Teacher Education.

[22] Ibid., p. iv.

[23] Ibid., p. 10.

[24] Lierheimer, The English Record, XX, No. 1.

[25] Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, State of Florida Department of Education, pp. 5-9.

[26] State of Florida Department of Education.

[27] K. Fred Daniel, "The Florida Program for Improving the Training, Evaluation and Licensure of Educational Personnel" (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education, April 7, 1971).

[28] Ibid., p. 6.

[29] Robert C. Burkhart (ed.), The Assessment Revolution: New Viewpoints for Teacher Evaluation (Albany, New York: New York State Education Department, 1969), pp. v-vi.

[30] Hite.

[31] Drummond, William H., "The Role of the State Education Agency in the Evolving Society," Speech given to the Association for Student Teaching at Chicago, February 27, 1969.

[32] Ibid., p. 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bosley, Howard E. (ed.). Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. 1: An Experiment in Change. Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969.

Bosley, Howard E. (ed.). Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities. Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969.

Butts, R. Freeman and Cremin, Lawrence A. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953.

Campbell, Roald F., Sroufe, Gerald E., and Layton, Donald H. (eds.). Strengthening State Departments of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1967.

Carlson, Richard O., and Kiernan, Owen B. A Plan for Curriculum Innovation in Massachusetts. Boston: Massachusetts State Department of Education, 1966.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Council of Chief State School Officers. State and Local Responsibilities for Education. Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1968.

Council of Chief State School Officers. The State Department of Education. Washington, D. C.: National Council of Chief State School Officers, 1952.

Council of Chief State School Officers. Responsibilities of State Departments of Education for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1954.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.

Fuller, Edgar, and Pearson, Jim B. (eds.). Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Grieder, Calvin, Pierce, Truman M., and Rosenstengel, William Everett. Public School Administration. Second edition. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1961

Kinney, Lucien B. Certification in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Morphet, Edger L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959.

Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration -- Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Pearson, Jim B. and Fuller, Edgar (eds.). Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Pierce, Truman M. Federal, State, and Local Government in Education. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.

Smith, B. Othanel et al. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Stinnett, T.M. A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States. Washington, D. C.: The National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, In Cooperation with the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1970.

Woodring, Paul. New Directions in Teacher Education. New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Educaiton, 1957.

Articles and Periodicals

Allen, Wendell C. "State Government and Teacher Education -- A Different Role for the State Education Agency," The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 76-83.

Anderson, Earl W. and Rusher, Elfreda M. "Staff-Certification," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Chester W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960, pp. 1354-1357.

Andrews, Theodore E. "Certification Reform: The Search for 'Better Folk'," New York State Education, LVII, No. 5 (February, 1970), pp. 17-19.

Andrews, Theodore E. "Performance Certification -- No, Education for Competency ---- Yes," *Communicate*, I, No. 1 (November, 1970), pp. 1-5.

Archer, Clifford P. "In-Service Education," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. Edited by Chester W. Harris. *New York: The MacMillan Company*, 1960, pp. 702-710.

Armstrong, W. Earl. "A Basis for Reciprocity in Teacher Certification," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 217-223.

Armstrong, W. Earl. "The Further Education of Teachers in Service," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XIX, No. 1 (Spring, 1968), pp. 33-38.

Armstrong, W. Earl, and Bosley, Howard E. "The State Education Agency in Teacher Education," *Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities.* Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969, pp. 1-19.

Bhaerman, Robert D. "Which Way for Teacher Certification," *QUEST Paper*, II, (February, 1969), pp. 1-11.

Bush, Robert N. and Allen, Wendell C. "Certification and Professional Performance," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 262-273.

Cantor, Arnold. "Autonomy is the Cure for Certification Woes," *New York State Education*, LVII, No. 5 (February, 1970), pp. 20-22.

Carman, Harry J. "The Historical Development of Licensing for the Professions," *The Journal of Teacher Education*, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 136-147.

Childress, Jack R. "In-service Education of Teachers,"*Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* Edited by Robert L. Ebel. London: The MacMillan Company, 1969, pp. 645-654.

Collins, George J. "Constitutional and Legal Basis for State Action," *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900.* Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Conant, James B. "The Certification of Teachers: The Restricted State-Approved Program Approach," *AACTE: A Decade of Thought on Teacher Education: The Charles W. Hunt Lectures.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969, pp. 109-142.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Managing Education: Educators Seeking Effective Techniques," *Florida Schools*, XXXIII, No. 3 (January-February, 1971), pp. 14-18.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: What Is It and Why Do We Need It?" Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel. Edited by Joel L. Burdin and Margaret T. Reagan. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, 1971, pp. 3-9.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Shaping the Future of Florida Education," Florida Schools, XXXIII, No. 5 (May-June, 1971), pp. 27-31.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Whither Teacher Education?" Teacher Education in Transition, Vol. II: Emerging Roles and Responsibilities. Baltimore: The Multi-State Teacher Education Project, 1969, pp. 20-36.

Darland, D. D. "The Role of the Profession in Teacher Certification," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 201-206.

Drummond, William H. "The Meaning and Application of Performance Criteria in Staff Development," The Phi Delta Kappan, LII, No. 1 (September, 1970), pp. 32-35.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Progress in Professional Practices Legislation," NEA Journal, LVII, No. 2 (February, 1968), pp. 64-65.

Fuller, Edgar. "State School Systems," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Chester W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960, pp. 1385-1397.

Greene, Jay E. "Qualifying Examinations Plus Institutional Recommendation for Teacher Certification," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 239-243.

Haskew, Laurence D. "Teacher Education - Organization and Administration," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Chester W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960, pp. 1454-1461.

Hill, Warren G. "The Dynamic Duo," The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 1-23.

Hite, Herbert. "POINT -- An Innovation in Teacher Education and State Leadership," The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 51-61.

Johns, Roe L. "State Organization and Responsibility for Education," Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project. Edited by Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan. New York: The Citation Press, 1967, pp. 245-272.

Koerner, James D. "How Not to Teach Teachers," The Atlantic, CCXI, (February, 1963), pp. 59-63.

LaBue, Anthony C. "Teacher Certification in the United States: A Brief History," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 147-173.

Lieberman, Myron. "Considerations Favoring National Certification of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 191-201.

Lierheimer, Alvin P. "Cast Off the Bowline!" Today's Education, CVIII, No. 3 (March, 1969), p. 62.

Lierheimer, Alvin P. "Changing the Palace Guard," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, No. 1 (September, 1970), pp. 20-25.

Lierheimer, Alvin P. "Give Up the Ship: A New Baiss for State Certification," The English Record, XX, No. 1 (October, 1969), pp. 64-70, ED 035 646.

Massanari, Karl. AACTE Explores Performance-Based Teacher Education," Bulletin, XXIV, No. 1 (March, 1971), pp. 2, 6.

Mayor, John R. "Creative and Constructive Adaptation," The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 34-45.

Mosier, Earl E. "Proficiency Examinations - A Wise or Unwise Policy?" The Journal of Teacher Education, XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 223-231.

Pendergraft, Daryl. "The Process Versus the Product Issue in the Accreditation of Teacher Education," Evaluative Criteria for Accrediting Teacher Education. Edited by Karl Massanari. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967, pp. 84-89.

Rackley, J. R., and Miller, Norman A. "Broad Policy Concerns and Direction for a State Department of Education in Teacher Education," The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education. Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 14-23.

Roe, William H. "Organizational Patterns: State and Federal," Review of Educational Research, XXXI, No. 4 (October, 1961), pp. 368-379.

Roe, William H. "State Regulation of Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Robert L. Ebel. London: The MacMillan Company, 1969, pp. 1299-1307.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration. *Linking Schools to State Education Departments*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, September, 1970. ED043117.

Florida State Board of Education. *Florida State Board of Education: Regulations*. Tallahassee, Florida, September, 1970.

Frinks, Marshall L. *Emerging State Agency- Institutions of Higher Learning Relationships and Procedures In Planning and Effecting Improvements In the Preparation and Certification of Educators.* Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education Project, Fall, 1970.

Improving State Leadership in Education Project. *Emerging State Responsibilities for Education.* Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education Project, 1970.

Interstate Certification Project. *Taking Your Talents Across State Lines.* Albany, New York: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification, undated.

Lierheimer, Alvin P. *An Anchor to Windward: A Framework of State Certification to Accommodate Current Development in Differentiating Staff Roles.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, April, 1969.

Mayor, John R. *Accreditation in Teacher Education, Its Influence on Higher Education.* Washington, D. C.: The National Commission On Accrediting, 1965.

Medley, Donald M. *Specifications for a New Teacher Examination: A First Approximation.* Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, September, 1970.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. *Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education.* Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education, Division of Teacher Personnel, 1968.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *Guidelines for Professional Standards Boards.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, January, 1967.

National Education Association, Committee on Tax Education and School Finance. *Guides to the Development of State School Finance Programs.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1949.

National Education Association. *Working Paper: Autonomy for the Teaching Profession.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969.

New York State Education Department. State Education Department's Policies and Practices in the Approved Program Approach to Teacher Certification. Albany, New York: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1968. ED029852.

Rich, William B. Approval and Accreditation of Public Schools: Responsibilities and Services of State Departments of Education. U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 36. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

State of Washington. Guidelines for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification. Second Draft. Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, April 20, 1967.

State of Washington. Guidelines for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification. Third Draft. Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, September, 1967.

State of Washington. Standards for Teacher Education. Olympia, Washington: Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1962.

State of Washington. Statement of Standards for Preparation of School Professional Personnel Leading to Certification. Fourth Draft. Olympia, Washington: Superintendent of Public Instruction, April, 1968.

Unpublished Material

Allen, Wendell C. "Accreditation of Teacher Education." A memorandum sent to members of The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, May 1, 1969.

Andrews, Theodore E. "Competency-Based Certification." Pre-publication draft, 1971, manuscript.

Apgar, Wilbur E. "Evolution of the Office of Chief State School Officer in New Jersey." Doctor's Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1958.

Armstrong, W. Earl. "Summary on Certification Requirements in the United States." Unpublished paper, January, 1968.

Buser, Robert L., and Mumm, William L. "State Education Agencies: A Bibliography." Unpublished manuscript. Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, July, 1969. ED034297.

Cady, Lillian V. "Preparation of School Professional Personnel in Washington State." Paper read to the Annual Conference of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, July 18, 1969.

Cohen, Saul B., and Lichtenberg, Mitchell P. "Final Report: Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes." Worcester, Mass: Training Complex Project Administrative Center, Clark University, July 1, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Colton, David L. "State Power and Local Decision-Making in Education." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February 8, 1969.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Consortiums." Unpublished paper prepared at the request of the Chairman of Task Force '72, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, U. S. Office of Education, June 8, 1971.

Daniel, K. Fred. "Performance-Based Teacher Certification: Florida's Projected Program." An unpublished paper prepared as a discussion document for use by staff members in the Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, May 5, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Daniel, K. Fred. "The Florida Program for Improving the Training, Evaluation, and Licensure of Educational Personnel." Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education, April 7, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

Drummond, William H. "The Role of the State Education Agency in the Evolving Society." Speech given to the Association for Student Teaching at Chicago, February 27, 1969.

Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council. "Revision of Chapter V, Regulations of the State Board of Education." New Regulations proposed by the Florida Teacher Education Advisory Council, March, 1971.

Frinks, Marshall Lee, Jr., "An Analytical Study of Teacher Certification Processes as Perceived by Leadership Personnel Within the Teacher Education and Certification Sections of the Fifty State Education Agencies with Special Emphasis on the Development of the Performance-Based Movement." Doctor's Thesis, University of Massachusetts, 1971.

Garofalo, Marious Peter. "The Origin and Establishment of a State Board of Education in Ohio." Doctor's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1958.

Golden, William Cecil. "The Role of the State Department of Education in Managing Teacher Education and Certification." Paper read to the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Diego, California, July 29, 1971.

McCoy, Eugene Mateer. "History and Development of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction to 1945." Doctor's Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1959.

New York State Education Department. "A New Style of Certification." Albany, New York: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1971.

Prince, David Hyde. "A History of the State Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina, 1852-1956." Doctor's Thesis, University of North Carolina, 1959.

Ross, J. Alan. "Improvement of Teacher Education in the State of Washington," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of the State Department of Education in Teacher Education.* Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 45-51.

Schalock, H. Del. "The Focus: Knowledge, Teaching Behavior, or the Products?" *Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel.* Edited by Joel L. Burdin and Margaret T. Reagan. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and The Association of Teacher Educators, 1971, pp. 41-49.

Selden, William K. "Why Accredit Teacher Education?" *The Journal of Teacher Education,* IX, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 185-191.

Shearouse, H. S. "Planned Programs of Teacher Education Versus Evaluation," *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 285-291.

Simandle, Sidney. "Certification Across State Lines," *NEA Journal*, LV, No. 9 (December, 1965), pp. 56-58.

Slaughter, Eugene E. "The Use of Examinations for State Certification of Teachers," *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 231-239.

Stiles, Lindley J. "Teacher Education Programs," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* Edited by Robert L. Ebel. London: The MacMillan Company, 1969, pp. 1414-1423.

Stinnett, T. M. "Certification Requirements and Procedures Among the States in 1960," *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 173-185.

Stinnett, T. M. "Teacher Certification," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research.* Edited by Robert L. Ebel. London: The MacMillan Company, 1969, pp. 1410-1414.

Stinnett, T. M. "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accreditation," *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900.* Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969, pp. 381-437.

Stone, James C. "The Future of Teacher Education: Implications for a State Department of Education," *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education.* Edited by Roy A. Edelfelt and Wendell C. Allen. Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967, pp. 23-34.

Viall, William P. "The NASDTEC-AAAS Teacher Preparation-Certification Study," *The Journal of Teacher Education,* XI, No. 2 (June, 1960), pp. 273-276.

Winget, Lerue W., Fuller, Edgar and Bell, Terrell H. "State Departments of Education Within State Governments," *Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900.* Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1969, pp. 1354-1357.

Reports

Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. *The State of State Departments of Education.* The Fourth Annual Report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Burdin, Joel L., and Reagan,Margaret T. (eds.). *Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel.* Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education and the Association of Teacher Educators, 1971.

Burkhart, Robert C. (ed). *The Assessment Revolution: New Viewpoints for Teacher Evaluation.* Albany, New York: New York State Education Department, 1969.

Edelfelt, Roy A. (ed.). *Innovative Programs in Student Teaching.* A Report of a conference in Baltimore Maryland. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1969.

Edelfelt, Roy A. and Allen, Wendell C. (eds.). *The Seattle Conference: The Role of The State Department of Education in Teacher Education.* Olympia, Washington: State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1967.

Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. *A New Order in Student Teaching: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1967.

Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. *Who's in Charge Here?: Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching.* Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1966.

New Mexico State Department of Education. *Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project, Final Report.* Santa Fe: New Mexico State Department of Education, 1969.

New York State Education Department. *The Five-College Project.* A report of the proceedings of the Five-College Project Conference. Albany, New York: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1968.

Rosner, Benjamin, et al. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education. Final Report of the Committee on National Program Priorities in Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education, July 31, 1971.

Other Sources

Alaska State Department of Education. Statewide Planning for Programs in Education, Alaska State Department of Education. Juneau: Alaska State Department of Education, 1968.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, March, 1970.

Andrews, Theodore E. New Directions in Certification. Report of a Study Sponsored by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; the State Board of Education in the State of Washington; and Improving State Leadership in Education Project. Denver, Colorado: Improving State Leadership in Education Project, September, 1970.

Beach, Fred F. The Functions of State Departments of Education. U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 12. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950.

Beach, Fred F., and Will, Robert F. The State and Education: The Structure and Control of Public Education at the State Level. U. S. Office of Education, Miscellaneous No. 23. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1955.

Brickell, H. M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change. Albany: New York State Department of Education, December, 1960.

Brooks, Richard D. Comprehensive Planning in State Educational Agencies: A Rationale and Discussion of the Planning Function and Structure within State Education Agencies. Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

Cottrell, Donald P. Selected Bibliography on the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, February, 1970.

Daniel, K. Fred. The Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching: A Conceptualization of a Plan For Use In State Educational Leadership. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, May, 1969. ED018862.

Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, State of Florida Department of Education. Criteria For Designing, Developing and Approving A District Master Plan for Inservice Teacher Education. Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, April, 1970.

Ruff, Otto George. "The Development of State School Administration in Nebraska." Doctor's Thesis, University of Nebraska, 1959.

Schalock, H. Del. "Alternative Strategies and Foci for Teacher Education." Monmouth, Oregon: Oregon State System of Higher Education, Teaching Research Division, 1970.

Smith, B. Othanel. "Certification of Educational Personnel." Paper read to the Council of Chief State School Officers, San Diego, California, July 29, 1971.

State of Florida Department of Education. "Florida's Strategy for Stimulating Constructive Change and Self-Renewal in Education." Tallahassee, Florida: State Department of Education, August, 1971.

Thomason, Jay Emmett. "The Development of the Administrative Organization of the Public School System of Alabama." Doctor's Thesis, University of Alabama, 1959.

Wimpey, John Andrew. "An Appraisal of State Educational Administrative and Supervisory Functions in Georgia." Doctor's Thesis, Goerge Peabody College for Teachers, 1958.